



भारत का राजपत्र

The Gazette of India

प्राप्तिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० ८] नई इलालो, शनिवार, फरवरी १९६६/माघ ३०, १८८७
No. 8] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1966/MAGHA 30, 1887

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ बांस्था की जाती है जिससे कि उह अलग संख्यान के रूप में रखा जा सके।

Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed
as a separate compilation

नोटिस

NOTICE

नीचे लिखे भारत के असाधारण राजपत्र ९ फरवरी, १९६६ तक प्रकाशित किए थे।

The undermentioned Gazettes of India Extraordinary were published up to the 9th February 1966:—

Issue No.	No. and Date	Issued by	Subject
23	S. O. 423, dated 2nd February, 1966.	Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.	Approval of the films as specified therein.
24	S.O. 424, dated 2nd February, 1966.	Ministry of Commerce	Appointing Shri M. L. Tandon, Section Officer, office of the Registrar of Newspapers for India, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, New Delhi to exercise the powers of the Controller under the Newsprint Control Order, 1962.
25	S. O. 425, dated 3rd February, 1966.	Do.	Cast iron manhole covers and frames should be subject to inspection prior to export as specified in the annexure therein.
26	S.O. 426, dated 3rd February, 1966.	Cabinet Secretariat	Amendments in the Government of India [(Allocation of Business) Rules, 1961.

Issue No.	No. and Date	Issued by	Subject
27	S. O. 427, dated 3rd February, 1966.	Feb- Ministry of Mines and Metals	Amendments in the notification No. S. O. 3987, dated 24th December, 1965.
	S. O. 428, dated 3rd February, 1966.	Feb- Do.	Amendment in the notification No. S. O. 3988, dated 24th December, 1965.
28	S.O. 429, dated 7th February, 1966.	Feb- Ministry of Commerce	The pesticides and their formulations specified in Annexure shall be subject to quality Control and inspection prior to export.
	S. O. 430, dated 7th February, 1966.	Feb- Do.	Recognition of the Indian Standards Institution Certification Mark with respect to pesticides and their formulations.
	S. O. 431, dated 7th February, 1966.	Feb- Do	The Export of Pesticides (Inspection) Rules, 1965.
29	S. O. 432, dated 7th February, 1966.	Feb- Do.	Further Amendments to the Export (Control) Order, 1962.
30	S. O. 477, dated 9th February, 1966.	Feb- Ministry of Labour & Employment	The Personal Injuries (Compensation Insurance) Amendment Scheme, 1966.
	S. O. 478, dated February, 1966.	9th Do.	The Personal Injuries (Compensation Insurance) Amendment Rules, 1966.
31	S. O. 479, dated 9th February, 1966.	Feb- Ministry of Commerce	Organic Chemicals mentioned in the Schedule annexed thereto shall be subject to inspection prior to export.
32	S. O. 480, dated 9th February, 1966.	Feb- Do.	Recognition of certain Organisations as agencies for the inspection of the Organic Chemicals as specified in the Schedule therein.
	S. O. 481, dated 9th February, 1966.	Feb- Do.	The Export of Organic Chemicals (Inspection) Rules, 1966.
33	S. O. 482, dated 9th February, 1966.	Feb- Do.	Paints and allied products shall be subject to quality Control and inspection prior to export.
34	S. O. 483, dated 9th February, 1966.	Feb- Do.	Recognition of certain Organisations as agencies for the inspection of the Paints and allied products as mentioned in the Schedules therein.

Issue No.	No. and Date	Issued by	Subject
S. O. 484, dated 9th February, 1966.	Do.	The Export of Paints and Allied Products (Inspection) Rules, 1966.	

उपर लिखे असाधारण गजटों की प्रतियां प्रकाशन प्रबन्धक, सिविल लाइन्स, दिल्ली के मात्र मांगपत्र भेजने पर भंज दी जाएँगी। मांगपत्र प्रबन्धक के पास इन राजपत्रों के जारी होने की सारित्स से 10 दिन के भीतर पहुंच जाने चाहिए।

Copies of the Gazettes Extraordinary mentioned above will be supplied on indent to the Manager of Publications, Civil Lines, Delhi. Indents should be submitted so as to reach the Manager within ten days of the date of issue of these Gazettes.

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उपखण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ केन्द्र प्रशासन को छोड़कर) केन्द्रीय प्राधिकरणों प्रारंभ जारी किए गए विभिन्न आवृत्ति और अधिसूचनाएँ।

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and by Central Authorities (other than the Administration of Union Territories).

ELECTION COMMISSION, INDIA

New Delhi, the 5th February 1966

S.O. 498.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13A of the Representation of the People Act, 1950, the Election Commission, in consultation with the Administration of Dadra and Nagar Haveli, hereby nominates Shri H. K. Khan, I.A.S., as the Chief Electoral Officer for the Union territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli with effect from the date he takes over charge and until further orders.

[No. 154/26/65.]

By Order,

PRAKASH NARAIN, Secy.

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

RUBBER CONTROL

New Delhi, the 8th February 1966

S.O. 499.—On return from leave, Shri T. V. Joseph resumed duty as Secretary, Rubber Board, Kottayam, on the forenoon of the 19th January, 1966.

[No. 21(6)Plant(B)/64.]

B. KRISHNAMURTHY, Under Secy.

(Office of the Jt. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)

(Central Licensing Area)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 22nd October 1965

S.O. 500.—Whereas Messrs. Motwane Electronic Industries, E-42, Connought Place, New Delhi or any bank or any other person have not come forward furnishing sufficient cause, against Notice No. JCC.I/I(CLA)/M-18/65/1523 dated 18th September 1965 proposing to cancel licence number P/SS/1578544/C/XX/20/C/D/20 dated 20th March 1965 for import of Domestic Radio Parts for Rs. 33,716/- granted to said Messrs. Motwane Electronic Industries, E-42, Connought Place, New Delhi by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports & Exports (Central licensing Area) New Delhi Govt. of India in the Ministry of Commerce in exercise of the powers conferred by the Clause-9 of the Import (Control) Order 1955, hereby cancel the said licence No. P/SS/1578544/C/XX/20/C/D/19-20 dated 20/3/65 issued to Messrs. Motwane Electronic Industries, E-42, Connought Place, New Delhi.

[No. JCC.I/I(CLA)/M-18/65/2177.]

S. K. SEN,

Jt. Chief Controller.

MINISTRY OF HEALTH

New Delhi, the 9th February 1966

S.O. 501.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 14 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), the Central Government, after consultation with the Medical Council of India, hereby directs that the medical qualification M.D. (Iowa, U.S.A.), shall be a recognised medical qualification for the purpose of that Act.

[No. F. 18-49/65-MPT.]

S.O. 502.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 13 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), the Central Government, after consulting the Medical Council of India, hereby makes the following amendment in Part II of the Third Schedule to the said Act, namely:—

In the said Part of the Third Schedule, after the entry “General Physician (Patrice Lumumba Friendship University, Moscow)” the following entries shall be inserted, namely:—

“M.B.B.S. (Institute of Medicine I, Rangoon)

M.B.B.S. (Institute of Medicine, III, Mandalay)

M.B.B.S. (Sind-West Pakistan)”.

[No. F. 18-80/65-MPT.]

S.O. 503.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 14 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), the Central Government, after consultation with the Medical Council of India, hereby directs that the medical qualification M.D. (Hahnemann Medical College, Philadelphia, Penn, U.S.A.) shall be recognised medical qualification for the purposes of that Act.

[No. F. 18-53/65-MPT.]

K. M. L. GUPTA, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

New Delhi, the 9th February 1966

S.O. 504.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 25 of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956 (3 of 1956), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the University Grants Commission Returns and Information Rules, 1957, published with the notification of the Government

of India in the late Ministry of Education and Scientific Research No. F. 24-10/56-U5, dated the 28th October, 1957, namely:—

1. These rules may be called the University Grants Commission Returns and Information (Amendment) Rules, 1966.
2. In the University Grants Commission Returns and Information Rules, 1957, in clause (d) of rule 4, for the figure, letters and word '1st October', the figures, letters and word '15th December' shall be substituted.

[No. F. 9-53/65-U2.]

TRIYOGI NARAIN, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 8th February 1966

S.O. 505.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 5 of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (11 of 1948), the Central Government, after considering the advice of the Committee constituted under clause (a) of sub-section (1) of the said section, hereby revises the minimum rates of wages fixed under the said Act in respect of the categories of employees employed on the construction or maintenance of roads or in building operations in such portions of the railways as are situated in the Union territory of Delhi and makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour No. LWI-24(74) dated the 18th March, 1952, namely:—

In the Schedule annexed to the said notification, in the entries relating to "3. Delhi", in column 3, for the heading "Employment on road construction or in building operations" and the entries thereunder, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

"Employment on the construction or maintenance of roads or in building operations".

1. Adults

	Rs. Paise
(a) Beldar of Mazdoor (Male)	.. 2.50
(b) Beldar or Mazdoor (Female)	.. 2.25
(c) Watchman or Chowkidar	.. 2.50
(d) Other unskilled employees	.. 2.50

2. Adolescents

.. 1.80

Note.—The rates fixed are inclusive of the payment for the weekly day of rest and no separate payment would be necessary on this account.

2. This notification shall come into force on and from the 1st March, 1966.

[No. LWI(I)6(4)/64.]

O. P. TALWAR, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 9th February 1966

S.O. 506.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Delhi in respect of an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 1st February, 1966.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DELHI

PRESENT:

Shri Anand Narain Kaul, Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Delhi
 31st December 1965

REFERENCE I.D. No. 6 of 1965

BETWEEN THE

Employers in relation to the State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur.

AND

Its workmen as represented by the State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur Employees' Union, Katra Shahenshahi, Chandni Chowk, Delhi.

Shri V. Sagar and Dinesh Chandra—for the management.

Shri Ram Lal Anand—for the workmen.

AWARD

By S.O. dated 1st November, 1965, the Central Government was pleased to refer to this Tribunal for adjudication an industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur (to be referred to hereinafter as the Bank) and its workmen represented by the State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur Employees' Union, Katra Shahenshahi, Chandni Chowk, Delhi (to be referred to hereinafter as the Union). The reference which has been made under Section 10, sub-section (2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is based on a joint application made by the two parties for referring the dispute to a Tribunal for adjudication. The dispute has been stated as follows in the schedule sub-joined to the reference:—

"Whether in the circumstances of the case of offence under section 323 I.P.C. of which the workman Shri Ram Bilas has been convicted and sentenced to undergo imprisonment and fine involves moral turpitude and if so, is the management bound or at any rate justified under section 10(1)(b)(i) of the Banking Companies Act 1949 to order his discharge from the service of the Bank?"

2. In response to the usual notices issued to the parties, both have filed their written statements and their rejoinders. In the very nature of the case no oral evidence was called for and the only documents filed are a certified copy each of the judgments of the learned Magistrate, 1st Class, Delhi Annexure 'A', of the appellate judgment of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Delhi, Annexure 'B' and of the revisional order of the Hon'ble Punjab High Court, Annexure 'C', all made in the criminal case, against Shri Ram Bilas and others, which has led to the present dispute. I have heard the learned advocates representing the parties namely, Shri Vidya Sagar representing the bank and Shri Ram Lal Anand representing the union and proceed to record my findings on the dispute.

Findings

3. The facts of the case which are not in dispute are, that Shri Ram Bilas and three other co-accused were challaned by the Gandhi Nagar Police, Delhi to the court of the 1st Class, Magistrate, Delhi to stand their trial U/S. 323 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code. The Magistrate held all the accused guilty of the above stated offence and sentenced each to rigorous imprisonment for a period of four months and a fine of Rs. 200/- or in default to undergo further rigorous imprisonment for four months. On appeal the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Delhi altered the conviction to one only under Section 323 IPC but maintained the sentence as passed by the learned Magistrate. In revision the Hon'ble High Court by a summary order, reduced the sentence of imprisonment to the period already undergone and a fine of Rs. 300/- in all in the case of each petitioner. The Court also directed that out of the fine, if realised Rs. 500/- be paid as compensation to Karori Mal, the injured person. In default of payment of fine, each of the petitioners was directed to undergo rigorous imprisonment for four months.

4. The prosecution case as stated in the order of the learned magistrate on the basis of evidence of Karori Mal, PW who was running a milk and tea shop in Daryaganj Bazar, is that on the 10th September, 1961 at about 2-30 P.M., when the witness was going to Babu Ram, an employee of the Corporation to submit his application for the repairs of his house, he saw all the four accused

persons, who were armed with 'Lathis', coming out of the street near the house of one Chetan Das. They all shouted that Karorimal was a 'Jain' and should be given a beating and then all the accused started beating, with lathis, Karorimal who sustained several injuries. Madanlal, Babulal and Joti Pershad, witnesses who happened to be present witnessed the occurrence and rescued the injured person. On medical examination of the injuries Karorimal was found to have sustained a fracture of the head bone and to have received 11 other injuries which were simple. In their statements before the trial court the accused denied the allegations of the prosecution. Hari Pershad accused stated that he was a leading man amongst 'Purbias', that there were ill-feelings between 'Jains' and 'Purbias' and that he had been falsely implicated in the case. He also added that on the day of occurrence he was performing 'Katha'. A similar statement was made by Shri Ram Blas, the workman concerned. Shri Rameshwar accused pleaded alibi. The fourth accused Ajudhya Pershad stated that, on the day of occurrence while he was going on his cycle along with his wife, Suresh Chander and Joti asked him not to go on cycle to which he replied that his house was nearby and he would get down. At this Suresh Chander abused him and started beating him with fists and slaps and on his raising alarm, Karorimal and Hoshan Lal came there and belaboured them with 'Lathis'. He himself received several injuries on his head. In his judgment the learned magistrate himself observed that there could hardly have been a premeditated intention or a motive for the crime because the fight took place all of a sudden, and it was mentioned in the FIR Ext. PA. that there was a quarrel between Ajudhya Pershad accused, and Suresh and others on account of "striking of a cycle against the wife of the friend of Suresh." It was because of this that the accused came out and shouted that Karorimal was a 'Jain' and should be beaten. In this connection the learned magistrate observed that "probably, there were ill feelings between the 'Jains' and 'Purbias' and Karorimal Jain had been beaten by the 'Purbias' to avenge their grievance." It also appears from the judgment of the learned magistrate that Shri Ajudhya Pershad accused was examined on the day of the occurrence by Dr. Ramesh Chander who found that he had received one simple injury namely a lacerated wound on the forehead. In regard to this injury Karorimal appears to have stated that the injury might have been caused by a 'Lathi' of one of the co-accused. The learned magistrate also came to the conclusion that, "very probably", this injury might have been sustained by Ajudhya Pershad at the hands of his own companions. While convicting the accused persons of an offence under Section 325 read with Section 34 IPC, the learned magistrate observed that since the accused had started the quarrel on communal grounds, a deterrent sentence of imprisonment was called for. In appeal before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, it was argued that the ingredients of Section 34 IPC were missing in the case since the accused did not attack the complainant after having made a previous preparation and the element of common intention was missing. Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code lays down that "When a criminal act is done by several persons, in furtherance of the common intention of all, each of such persons is liable for that act in the same manner as if it were done by him alone." Dealing with this contention the learned Additional Sessions Judge observed that the circumstances of the case were such that the prosecution had failed to establish that the accused had made an attack upon the complainant with a common intention after having made preparations to cause injuries on the person of the complainant. In his opinion the complainant happened to meet the accused while he was going to the house of Babu Ram to give an application and they pounced upon him suddenly and belaboured him. According to the learned judge the prosecution had also not been able to fix the responsibility as to which of the accused had caused the grievous injury. Relying on a decision of the Allahabad High Court in 1949 Allahabad page 191, he held that Section 34 IPC was inapplicable to the case and each one of the accused could be convicted under Section 323 of the Indian Penal Code and not under Section 325. In that case there was a sudden altercation between the complainant and one of the three accused during which all the accused beat the complainant in a fit of anger and without any pre-arranged plan, with the result that one of them caused a grievous hurt to the complainant. There was, however, no evidence on record as to which of them caused the grievous hurt. The learned Additional Sessions Judge, however, held that even though an offence under Section 323 IPC was made out, it made no difference as far as the quantum of sentence was concerned, since the accused attacked the complainant, who was empty handed, without any cause and caused on his person about 12 injuries, which showed how determined the accused were in causing the injuries on the person, of the complainant. He, accordingly altered the conviction to one under Section 323 IPC in the case of each of the accused persons while upholding the sentence. In the order of revision, the Hon'ble High Court has reduced the sentence of imprisonment to the period already undergone and a fine of Rs. 300/- in each case. It is a brief order and no reasons have been given. The order of

the learned Sessions Judge by which the accused persons were remanded to custody is dated the 16th August, 1963 while the order of the High Court is dated the 20th August, 1963. The accused persons were, therefore, actually made to serve a sentence of imprisonment for less than a week each and also a sentence of fine.

5. In view of the quantum of sentence of imprisonment ultimately maintained, it was argued, that the Hon'ble High Court had not agreed with the lower court that a deterrent sentence was called for in the circumstances of the case. It is however quite obvious from the findings of the learned Sessions Judge that a common intention was not attributable to the four accused persons and the offence committed by each of them was one of causing simple hurt under Section 323 IPC. On coming to know that Shri Ram Bilas had been convicted of an offence under Section 323 IPC, the management of the bank decided that Shri Ram Bilas could not be retained in the service of the bank as he had been convicted of an offence "involving moral turpitude" and was liable to be dismissed forth-with. Shri Ram Bilas supported by the union of which he is a member challenged this view of the bank and hence this joint reference.

6. The occasion for the bank's proposed action to terminate the services of Shri Ram Bilas arises from the provisions of Section 10(1)(b)(i) of the Banking Companies Act. The relevant portion of Section 10(1)(b)(i) reads as under:

"No banking company shall employ or continue the employment of any person—who is, or at any time has been convicted by a criminal court of an offence involving moral turpitude."

The question in dispute, therefore, is whether the offence under Section 323 IPC of which Shri Ram Bilas has been convicted is one involving moral turpitude. If it is found that the offence involved moral turpitude then the bank is bound not to retain him in service. If on the contrary it is found that the offence did not involve moral turpitude then there is no justification for the bank to terminate his services.

7. Now the expression 'moral turpitude' has not been defined anywhere in the Indian Penal Code. However, a number of authorities on the meaning of the expression and its application to the facts of a particular case were cited by the learned advocate for the bank but both the parties have mainly relied on a decision of the Allahabad High Court, (AIR 1965 page 382). I would first to refer briefly to the earlier cases cited before me.

8. In the case between the Bank of Jaipur Limited and Shri Kishorelal (1954 LAC 362), the Labour Appellate Tribunal (Bombay) was dealing with an application for permission to discharge the respondent from service on the ground that he had been convicted of an offence involving moral turpitude. The respondent was a tenant of a room on the first floor of a building of which the ground floor had been previously occupied by his father-in-law, but that tenancy had been terminated about four or five years previously. When the ground floor was being repaired and had been white-washed, the respondent forcibly took the key from a labourer and entered into possession. When the landlord objected, his uncle was assaulted and the respondent was convicted for that criminal offence. On these facts it was held by the Labour Appellate Tribunal that the respondent had been convicted of an offence involving moral turpitude and that the permission to discharge him could not be withheld. This case has been cited on behalf of the bank in support of the argument that if an assault is an offence involving moral turpitude much more so is an offence of causing hurt under Section 323 IPC in the circumstances of the present case. Whether an offence of assault would involve moral turpitude would depend on the facts of the particular case and it is not every assault that could be deemed to involve moral turpitude. In the case in question there was an element of dishonesty inasmuch as the assault occurred when the landlord objected to the forcible possession taken by the accused person of premises to which he had not even the semblance of a title.

9. In the case between the Punjab National Bank Ltd., and Megh Singh Chowkidar (1957 II LLJ 290), a workman employed by the Bank was convicted under the Prohibition Act. It was held by the Labour Appellate Tribunal that in a State where prohibition law was in force, the conviction of a person by a criminal court on the charge of being found drunk with liquor must be regarded as "a grave infringement of the moral sentiments of the community", in other words, as an offence involving moral turpitude. The learned Tribunal referred to the definition of the expression "moral turpitude" in Webster's Dictionary (p. 1593) as the "quality of crime involving grave infringement of the moral

sentiments of the community", in other words, as an offence involving moral turpitude. The learned Tribunal referred to the definition of the expression "moral turpitude" in Webster's Dictionary (p. 1593) as the "quality of crime involving grave infringement of the moral sentiment of the community." In the same dictionary the term "turpitude" has been defined as meaning "inherent baseness or vileness of principle". A reference was also made to the definition of moral turpitude in Ramanatha Iyer's Law Lexicon. The definition therein is as follows:—

"Anything done contrary to justice, honesty, principle of good morals. An act of baseness, vileness or depravity in the private and social duties which a man owes to his fellowmen or to society in general, contrary to accepted customary rule of right and duty between man and man."

On these facts the Labour Appellate Tribunal allowed the appeal of the bank and reversed the order of the tribunal refusing the grant of permission to the appellants to dismiss the respondent from service. The offence of being found dead drunk in a public street is undoubtedly an act of depravity likely to offend the moral sentiments of the community. In the circumstances of the case the learned judges of the Labour Appellate Tribunal naturally held that the offence involved moral turpitude. This decision is, therefore, of no help to the management of the bank since a case of causing simple hurt stands on a quite different footing.

10. I now come to the case of Budha Pitai v. Sub-Divisional Officer Malihabad. Lucknow (AIR 1965 Allahabad 382) which is relied on by both the parties. The facts of the case are that one B was convicted for selling sweets coloured with metanil yellow of an offence under S. 16 read with S. 7 of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954, mixture of metanil yellow in food stuffs being prohibited under R. 28 of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Rules, 1955. He was sentenced to pay a fine. Subsequently B stood as a candidate for election to the office of Pradhan of the Gaon Sabha and got elected. His election was sought to be set aside under S. 5-A of U.P. Panchayat Raj Act on the ground that he had been convicted of an offence "involving moral turpitude" and thus was disqualified for being nominated or appointed to the office of Pradhan. Although the majority of the learned judges in the case held that the act of B in using metanil yellow in sweets could not be considered as an offence involving moral turpitude, that he was not disqualified for being nominated for the office of Pradhan of Gaon Sabha and that his nomination was not improperly accepted, the observations made by some of the judges in their judgments in the case are very important and useful as throwing light on the import of the expression, "offence involving moral turpitude". In his judgment Desai C.J. made the following observations:—

"In deciding whether a person is convicted of an offence involving moral turpitude there are two ways of looking at the matter, one of considering the nature of the act done and the other of considering the nature, of the offence punished under the statutory provision. Section 5-A speaks of "an offence involving moral turpitude" and suggests that what is to be seen is the nature of the offence which is made punishable by the statutory provision and not that of the act which is brought within its ambit. It must be the offence, i.e. the ingredients of the offence prescribed by the statutory provision, and not the act actually done, which must involve moral turpitude. There is nothing inherently immoral in using a colouring matter other than that prescribed in respect of the article in which it is used. It is only a prohibited act and it is an offence simply because it is a prohibited act."

Further on his lordship observed as follows:—

"Every act of mixing a substance with an article of food is not necessarily immoral. Whether it is so or not would depend upon the motive; if the motive is greed it may be immoral but not if it is simply to make the article more attractive or more delicious."

In a separate judgment it was observed by R. N. Sharma J. as follows:—

"Whether an offence involves moral turpitude will depend upon its nature and the circumstances in which it is committed. An offence of a certain class may generally be considered to involve moral turpitude but may not be so if committed in particular circumstances. It is not the gravity of the offence or the quantum of punishment which will determine the question."

In a dissenting judgment it was held by N. U. Beg J. as follows:-

"The Prevention of Food Adulteration Act is a social legislation of vital importance to the nation as a whole. Any person, who has been convicted of an offence under the Act, lowers himself morally as well as socially in the estimation of the public. Therefore, the conviction under Section 7/16 of the Act does involve moral turpitude. An analysis of the various clauses of S. 2(1) of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act indicates that a criminal or wrongful intent is the common feature of all offences relating to adulteration. The commission of each one of the acts enumerated in clauses (a) to (l) is regarded as highly blameworthy and shocking to the moral conscience of the society with the result that an offender indulging in them is regarded not only the enemy of the individual victim of the offence but of human society as a whole. The expression "offence involving moral turpitude".....merely means that the offence should be such as to have the effect of embarrassing a man socially by lowering him in public estimation. If an offence is such that the community regards a person convicted of such an offence as one who has committed a breach of social duties or obligations which a man owes to his fellowmen or one who has acted dishonestly or against the established moral standards of honesty and integrity or accepted rules of good conduct, then conviction for such an offence would involve moral turpitude. The important question, therefore, is not what the ingredients of the offence are but how the community at large views the offence..... Thus, any act involving a breach of any rule of good conduct or dereliction from principles of honesty, integrity and fairness in business-matter would involve "moral turpitude."

11. The principles laid down in the above observations of the learned judges could be aptly and fully applied to the facts of the present case to determine whether the offence committed by Shri Ram Bilas involves moral turpitude. Now it is impossible to hold that a mere offence of voluntarily causing hurt or even grievous hurt would ordinarily involve moral turpitude. Much would depend on the circumstances in which the offence is committed. A teacher or even a parent may, in a fit of anger cause simple or even grievous hurt in beating a naughty child but it could not be convincingly argued that such an offence involves moral turpitude. A "goonda" who has been a nuisance to a locality may be set upon by a number of persons out of righteous indignation at his conduct and belaboured even in furtherance of common intention, to punish him. The assailants would certainly merit punishment for taking the law into their own hands but it could be certainly argued with force that their offence does not involve moral turpitude. It is also not the quantum of punishment that an offence will attract, that will determine the question whether it involves moral turpitude. An offence of a petty theft may make the offender liable to a mere punishment of fine but there can be no doubt that every offence of theft, however, petty would involve moral turpitude, because it involves dis-honesty and is against the established moral standards of integrity and accepted rules of good conduct. But even an offence of causing grievous hurt under Section 325 IPC while it may make the offender liable to a heavy sentence of imprisonment may not in the circumstances of a particular case involve moral turpitude. For instance a person may be convicted of grievous hurt in exceeding the right of private defence and yet the offence would hardly involve moral turpitude.

12. Applying these principles to the facts of the present case I am unable to hold, in the light of the decision of the learned Additional Sessions Judge read with the final order of the High Court, that the offence committed by Shri Ram Bilas could be said to involve moral turpitude. If the findings of the learned magistrate that Shri Ram Bilas along with others committed the offence of causing hurt to Shri Karorimal because the latter happened to be a 'Jaini' had been up-held, then certainly the offence would have involved moral turpitude. That would have meant the commission of the offence on communal grounds and such an act would be looked down upon as a breach of social duties or obligations or against the established standards or rules of good conduct. The act would be abhorred by society. Since, however, the learned Additional Sessions Judge has held that the injuries to Shri Karorimal were caused as a result of a sudden quarrel without any previous preparation and in a fit of anger there is no finding express or implied that Shri Ram Bilas committed the offence under a communal motivation. The prosecution allegation that some of the accused shouted that Karori Mal should be beaten because he was a Jaini cannot be deemed to have been proved as against Ram Bilas. The fact that conviction under Section 34

was set aside by the learned Additional Sessions Judge goes to show that a common communal motivation was not attributed to Shri Ram Bilas.

13. For the foregoing reasons I hold that in the circumstances of the case the offence under Section 323 IPC, of which the workman Shri Ram Bilas has been convicted, does not involve moral turpitude and that the management would not be justified in ordering his discharge from the service of the bank under Section 10(1)(b)(i) of the Banking Companies Act, 1949. I make an award accordingly.

The 31st December, 1965.

Sd./- ANAND NARAIN KAUL,

Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal,
Delhi.

[No. F. 55(28)/65-LRIV.]

New Delhi, the 10th February 1966

S.O. 507.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Bombay in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to Bombay Port Trust, Bombay and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on 1st February 1966.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT
BOMBAY

REFERENCE No. CGIT 35 OF 1964.

Employers in relation to the Bombay Port Trust, Bombay.

AND

Its Workmen.

PRESENT:

Shri Salim M. Merchant, Presiding Officer.

For the Bombay Port Trust.—Shri M. R. S. Captain, Legal Adviser, with
Shri R. K. Shetty, Deputy Legal Adviser.

For the Bombay Stevedores' and Dock Labourers' Union.—Counsel C. L.
Dudhia, Bar-at-Law, and Vice-President, and Shri D. N. Tulpule,
General Secretary.

For the Bombay Port Trust Employees' Union.—Shri S. K. Shatye, Assistant
Secretary.

For the Bombay Port Trust General Workers' Union.—Shri S. Moitra, General
Secretary.

Dated at Bombay this 28th day of January 1966

INDUSTRY: Major Port.

STATE: Maharashtra.

AWARD

1. On a joint application of the Bombay Port Trust and the Bombay Stevedores' and Dock Labourers' Union dated 12th February, 1964, the Central Government, by the Ministry of Labour and Employment's Order No. 28/14/64/LRIV, dated 6th March, 1964, made in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act XIV of 1947), was pleased to refer the industrial dispute between the Bombay Port Trust and Its Workmen, in respect of the following subject matters specified in the parties' said joint application, to me for adjudication:—

- (1) "What should be the proper position of Shri C. R. Deurakhkar on the seniority list of fitters of the oil Pipe-Line Section, Alexandra Dock, from which promotion to the post of Charge-man is to be made, and
- (2) In the event of it being found that any change is required to be made in the present seniority of Shri Deurakhkar, as fixed by the Chief Engineer in 1960, should such a change be effected with retrospective effect, and if so, from what date?"

2. After the reference was made, Shri H. N. Trivedi, President of the Bombay Stevedores' and Dock Labourers' Union, filed a written statement of claim on behalf of his Union, dated 29th April, 1964. The Bombay Port Trust filed its written statement in reply to the statement of claim of the Bombay Stevedores' and Dock Labourers' Union on the 9th July, 1964. Shri C. R. Deurakhkar, the workman concerned also filed an affidavit dated 6th July, 1965, in support of his claim, and he also gave evidence. The Bombay Port Trust General Workers' Union and the Bombay Port Trust Employees' Union applied to be joined as parties. They, however, did not file any separate written statements, though they were represented at the hearing of the dispute. I may state that Shri Moitra, the General Secretary of the Bombay Port Trust General Workers' Union, generally supported the stand of the Bombay stevedores' and Dock Labourers' Union, but he was guarding the interests of another Fitter by the name of Shri Nikhale and the Bombay Port Trust Employees Union has generally supported the stand taken up by the Bombay Port Trust.

3. In its written statements and the submissions made at the hearing, the Bombay Port Trust has raised a preliminary legal objection to the maintainability of this reference, which was ably argued at the hearing by its Deputy Legal Adviser, Shri R. K. Shetty. The Bombay Port Trust's contention is that in fact and in effect this dispute is one relating to the promotion of an individual workman, Shri C. R. Deurakhkar, to the post of an Assistant Charge-man (Chargeman) which would be within the administrative functions of the Bombay Port Trust and could not, therefore, form the subject-matter of an industrial dispute as defined by section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the Act), and therefore, this is not a valid reference, and the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain the same.

4. In order to appreciate the objection urged, a brief recital of the facts of the case, and how the dispute came to be raised, is necessary. It appears that Shri C. R. Daurakhkar joined the Bombay Port Trust as a Trade Apprentice in the Workshop on 4th October, 1948. After completing the five years' course of apprenticeship, he was absorbed as a permanent fitter from 4th October, 1948, and without any break in service, he worked as a fitter in the Fitting Shop of the Bombay Port Trust's Workshop till 1952. According to the Port Trust, at his own request, he was transferred as a Fitter on the Oil Pipe-Line, Alexandra Docks, from 12th September, 1952, but according to C. R. Deurukhar, he was transferred because of administrative convenience of the employers. I may state that Shri C. R. Deurakhkar has given evidence on this point, but I am not impressed by it. I am not satisfied that Shri C. R. Deurakhkar's story that he was transferred to the Oil Pipe-Line from the Workshop by P. C. Dighe, the Leading-man, asking him to give the muster on the next day at the Oil Pipe-Line, Alexandra Docks. It is significant that Shri Dighe is now dead, and the witness admitted that he did not know whether Dighe was competent to transfer him. The manner in which Shri Deurakhkar gave answers on this point in his cross-examination did not impress me. It is further of significance that, as admitted by Shri Deurakhkar there was no other evidence except his bare word that he was transferred to the Oil Pipe-Line for administrative reasons. It appears to me that Shri Deurakhkar had himself really volunteered to go to work at the Oil Pipe-Line, Alexandra Docks, and that he was not transferred for administrative reasons. According to the Union, he presumed that on his transfer to the Oil Pipe-Line he would be promoted as Assistant Charge-man, which post is now designated as Chargeman, regardless of his sectional seniority. His Union has urged that the combined seniority of the fitters in the Workshop section and the Oil Pipe-Line section is taken into account for the purposes of promotion to the post of Assistant Charge-man or Chargeman. The Bombay Port Trust, however, contends that seniority in the service of Fitters for promotion to the post of Assistant Chargeman or Chargeman is judged on the basis of service in the Oil Pipe-Line, and not on the basis of combined service in the Workshop and the Oil Pipe-Line section. The Bombay Port Trust's further contention is that as Deurakhkar was transferred to the Oil Pipe-Line at his own request and not for administrative reasons, his seniority should be determined on a sectional basis of his service in the Oil Pipe-Line, and not on the basis of his combined service in the Workshop and the Oil Pipe Line. It is not necessary to go into further details of the contentions of the parties for determining the preliminary legal objection, as the legal objection raised is that, from the language of the Order of Reference, and the submissions made by the Bombay Stevedores' and Dock Labourers' Union in its written statement of claim, and in Deurakhkar's affidavit dated 6th July, 1965, it is clear that the whole dispute had been raised with a view to securing the promotion of Deurakhkar as Assistant Chargeman/Chargeman.

5. Now, it is well settled law that promotion is essentially a managerial function, and in the absence of *mala-fides*, normally it must be left to the discretion of the management as to which of the employees should be promoted at the given time. Their Lordships of the Supreme Court in the case of *Brooke Bond (India) (Pvt.) Ltd., and Their Workmen* (1963, I LLJ, page 256) observed as follows:—

"It is true that though promotions would normally be a matter of management function, if it appears that in promoting one employee in preference to another, the management has been activated by malicious consideration or that the failure to promote one eligible person amounts to unfair labour practice, that would be a different matter. But in the absence of *mala fides*, normally it must be left to the discretion of the management to select which of the employees should be promoted at the given time subject to the formula to which we have just referred."

In the same case, their Lordships, in an earlier portion of their judgement, observed as follows:—

"there could be no doubt that promotions to which industrial employees are entitled normally would be treated as a function of the management. It must be left to the discretion of the management to select persons for promotion. On the other hand, labour also wants that the claims of employees who are eligible for promotion should be duly considered."

6. In the pleadings of the parties there is no allegation whatsoever of *mala-fides* or favouritism on the part of the Bombay Port Trust with regard to the promotion claimed by Shri Deurakhkar. The whole question is whether a particular seniority list is or is not the correct one, and whether in preparing the seniority list combined service at the Workshop and the Oil Pipe-Line section or only the service in the latter section should have been taken into account. There is, therefore, no allegation of any *malafide* in selecting any particular Fitter over Deurakhkar out of favouritism or out of malicious consideration.

7. I may state that in my Award dated 8th July, 1965 in an earlier dispute Ref. No. CGIT 6 of 1964, between the Bombay Port Trust and the Bombay Port Trust Employees' Union, which was a reference under Section 10(2) of the Act, I upheld a similar objection [Government of India Gazette, Part II, Sec. 3(ii) dated 31st July, 1965 at pages 2605 to 2608]. I held that a dispute relating to promotion of an individual employee, even if the same is referred under Sec.10(2) of the Act, on the joint application of the parties would not invest the Tribunal with jurisdiction to try the dispute, as promotion is purely a managerial function, provided that there is no allegation of *mala-fides* or unfair labour practice.

8. The fact that this is a reference under Sec.10(2) of the Act, upon a joint application of the parties, would not preclude either party from raising the objection that what is referred for adjudication is not an industrial dispute, as defined by section 2(k) of the Act. [See decisions in the case of *East Asiatic Company Ltd., Bombay versus Its Workmen* (1960 I LLJ, page 383) and *Standard Drum and Barrel Manufacturing Co. versus Its Workmen* (961 I LLJ, page 130).]

9. Shri DUDHIA, the learned Counsel for the Union, has argued that a dispute with regard to seniority can be the subject-matter of an industrial dispute, and he has, in support, relied upon the decision of Justice Bind Basni Prasad in the case of the Indian Airlines Corporation [See Gazette of India Part II, Sec.3(ii) dated 28th March, 1959, at page 325]. By clearly, that decision is not applicable on facts, as in this case the real claim, as I shall presently point out, as made out in the correspondence and as stated in the pleadings, is for promotion of Shri C.R. Deurakhkar to the post of Assistant Chargeman/Chargeman.

10. It is true that in this case the dispute as stated in the order of reference is with regard to the proper position of Shri C. R. Deurakhkar in the seniority list of Fitters of the Oil Pipe-Line, Alexandra Docks, but the point is that the seniority is sought to be determined for the purposes of his being promoted to the post of Assistant Chargeman/Chargeman, as clearly stated in the Order of Reference itself. Therefore, the objection urged by the Bombay Port Trust is that, in fact and in effect, this is a dispute with regard to the promotion of Shri C. R. Deurakhkar to the post of Assistant Chargeman/Chargeman, and Shri R. K. SHETTY, Deputy Legal Adviser for the Bombay Port Trust, has argued that the pleadings and exhibits on record clearly show that that is the real claim as understood by

C. R. Deurakhkar himself, and I am satisfied that this is borne out from the following:—

(a) The first paragraph of the subject-matters in dispute, which I have extracted above, speaks of ".....from which promotion to the post of Assistant Charge-man is to be made". This shows that the real claim is one for promotion, and that the question of seniority is secondary thereto. To use the picturesque language of Shri R. K. Shetty, the pivotal point under reference is promotion, and the question of seniority is the satellite that revolves round this pivotal point.

(b) In the letters addressed by the Bombay Stevedores' and Dock Labourers' Union also, the question that was raised was one of promotion. The General Secretary of the Bombay Stevedores' and Dock Labourers' Union, in his letter No. DP/55/7/3 dated 7th March, 1960 (Ex. E1) addressed to the Mechanical Superintendent, Bombay Port Trust, had stated as follows:—

"It is understood that there is a vacancy at Pir Pau on the Oil Pipe Line of Assistant Charge-man and you are going to promote Shri Dourado who was appointed as a fitter on 24th December, 1950, as Assistant Charge-man. We bring to your notice that there are three fitters on the Oil Pipe-Line who are senior to Dourado, and who are quite fit for the post and possess the requisite merit. We therefore, request you not to promote Shri Dourado by upsetting the claim of his seniors".

In another letter dated 12th March, 1960 (Ex. E2) addressed to the General Manager Bombay Port Trust, the Union expressed its grief on learning that a decision had already been taken without giving it a chance. That the dispute of the Union was with regard to the claim for promotion of Deurakhkar is also clear from the Union's letter dated 6th March, 1963, to the Manager of the Bombay Port Trust (Ex. E3) where clearly, the only dispute was with regard to the promotion of Deurakhkar to the post of Assistant Charge-man/Charge-man. In that letter the President of the Union stated as follows:—

"We, therefore, demand that he (Deurakhkar) should be given acting appointment as Charge-man with immediate effect, as he is the senior-most in the Oil Pipe-Line section".

That the dispute was also understood by the Bombay Port Trust to be with regard to Deurakhkar's claim for promotion is clear from the letter dated 19th August, 1958, from the Secretary, Bombay Port Trust, to the President, Bombay Stevedores' and Dock Labourers' Union. Thus the correspondence on record which preceded this reference clearly shows that both parties understood the dispute as being with regard to the claim of Deurakhkar for promotion to the post of Assistant Charge-man.

(c) Read in this light, the second paragraph of the Order of Reference can only mean that the dispute of seniority is with regard to promotion of C. R. Deurakhkar.

(d) The petition of Deurakhkar dated 12th December, 1960, addressed to the Chief Engineer, Bombay Port Trust (Ex. E5) is with regard to his claim for promotion.

(e) That the dispute really is for promotion is also clear from the statements made in paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 6 of the statement of claim filed by the Bombay Stevedores' and Dock Labourers' Union on behalf of the workmen in this dispute, in which the whole case is argued on the basis of Deurakhkar's claim for promotion to the post of Assistant Charge-man/Charge-man. In paragraph (1) the Union has stated:—

"The dispute pertains to the seniority of Shri C. R. Deurakhkar, Fitter, Oil Pipe-Line, Alexandra Docks, Bombay Port Trust, for the purpose of promotion to the post of Charge-man (underlining mine)."

This averment clearly establishes that the dispute is, in fact and in effect, regarding the promotion of an individual fitter, namely Shri C. R. Deurakhkar, to the post of Assistant Charge-man/Charge-man. I am, therefore, satisfied that the question of seniority list is only used as a cloak or garb to convert a dispute which clearly, on statements made by the Union in the pleadings and in correspondence which preceded this reference, is with regard to promotion of an individual workman *viz.*, C. R. Deurakhkar, into an industrial dispute. I, therefore, uphold the preliminary objection urged by the Bombay Port Trust that this dispute being in fact and in effect in respect of the claim for promotion of Shri C. R. Deurakhkar,

it is not an industrial dispute and the reference is not valid, and I have therefore, no jurisdiction to entertain the same.

11. No order as to costs.

Sd./- SALIM M. MERCHANT,
Presiding Officer.

[No. 28/14/64-LRIV.]

S.O. 508.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Bombay in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to Shri C. I. Abraham and 66 others at Cochin and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on 1st February, 1966.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT-32 of 1963

Employers in relation to Shri C. I. Abraham and 66 others

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT:

Shri Salim M. Merchant, Presiding Officer.

For the employers (represented by the Cochin Port Boat-Owners' Association).—Shri George K. Verghese, Advocate, with Shri C. K. George, Secretary.

For the Shri New Dholera Shipping & Trading Co. Ltd.—Counsel Shri P. K. Kurian, Bar-at-Law of Messrs Menon & Pai, Advocates.

For the Cochin Port Cargo Labour Union.—Shri T. C. N. Menon, Advocate, with Shri T. M. Aboo, Secretary.

For the Cochin Thuramugha Thozhilali Union.—Shri K. A. Subramaniam, Advocate with Shri A. A. Kochunniy, Secretary.

For the Cochin Port Thozhilali Union.—Shri M. V. Joseph, Advocate, with Shri A. A. Muhamad Ali, Convenor.

Dated at Bombay this 28th day of January 1966

INDUSTRY: Major Port.

STATE: Kerala.

AWARD PART II

My Award Part I dated 4th day of November, 1965, was published in the Government of India Gazette, Part II, Section 3(ii) dated 27th November 1965 at pages 3849 to 3851. That Award covered all the demands under reference, except demands Nos. 1, 7, 9, 13 and 14 in the Schedule to the said Order of Reference. By this Award Part II, I am disposing of these five outstanding issues.

2. Before I deal with the remaining demands under this reference on their merits, it is necessary to deal with a petition dated 6th November 1964 filed by the employers Nos. 1, 3, 16, 18, 22, 24, 27, 29 to 32, 34 to 37, 42, 44 to 50, 52, 53, 55, 57, 63 and 65, purporting to be under Section 18(3)(b) of the Act, to summon the Cochin Chamber of Commerce and the Indian Chamber of Commerce at Cochin as parties to this dispute. The petition is sought to be supported on the ground that many of the matters specified in the schedule annexed to the Order of Reference in this case relate to the revision and fixation of wages and other remuneration of the boat-crew. As per Rule 24 of the Cochin Harbour Rules, 1947, made by the Central Government under the powers conferred on it by Sec. 6 C1 clause 1(k) of the Ports Act (Act XV of 1908), the Central Government sanctioned the rate of boat-hire in consultation with the Cochin Port; that the remuneration of the boat-crew is the prescribed share of the boat-hire; that whenever remuneration of the crew in the Cochin Port was revised and fixed, the boat-hire was also revised and fixed; that the Madurai Award in I.D. 18 (Central) of 1951 which dealt with lighterage labour provided that, "the crew shall be given an increase of 33½% in their present share of the boat-hire rates"; that to

provide for this increase in the share of the crew, clause 8 of schedule 2 also provides, "the above arrangements shall come into operation on and from the date the Port Administration approved the increase of 50% in the present hire-rate suggested by the Cochin Chamber of Commerce". The employers, in their petition have urged that a revision and re-fixation of the boat-hire rate is necessary for a revision and re-fixation of the remuneration of the boat-crew, if found necessary; that this revision and re-fixation of the boat-hire rates is incidental to the revision and re-fixation of the remuneration of the crew; that an increase in the boat hire rate has to be met immediately of in case of imports by the steamer agents from the landing charges calculated by them, and in case of exports, by merchants. Therefore, the steamer agents and merchants are interested and likely to be affected by the decision on the matters specified in the Order of Reference; that their presence as parties is necessary or proper for due and just adjudication of this dispute; that the Cochin Chamber of Commerce and the Indian Chamber of Commerce being the representatives of steamer agents and merchants, they have to be impleaded in this case on behalf of the steamer agents and merchants, and therefore, their presence as parties is necessary or at least proper for the due and just adjudication of this dispute. For these reasons, the employers in their said petition have prayed that the Tribunal be pleased to summon the Cochin Chamber of Commerce and the Indian Chamber of Commerce to appear in these proceedings as parties to this dispute.

3. The President, Cochin Chamber of Commerce, in his statement in reply dated 19th November, 1964, has submitted that this application was not maintainable, either in law or in fact, and should be dismissed in limine; he has urged that the Cochin Chamber of Commerce has nothing to do with the dispute referred for adjudication, which is between the boat-owners and the persons stated to be employed by them, in respect of the terms and conditions of service referred to in the Order of Reference. He has further submitted that the Cochin Chamber of Commerce has nothing to do with this dispute, as it is neither the owner of boats, nor is it in any manner connected with the workers employed by the boat-owners; that the fact of impleading the Chamber as a party to the adjudication would enlarge the ambit and alter the character of the dispute under adjudication; that no dispute had at any time been raised against the Cochin Chamber of Commerce by the concerned persons, that the fact that the steamer agents are members of the Cochin Chamber of Commerce does not make the Chamber a necessary or proper party, and that impleading the Chamber is wholly unnecessary for the due and just adjudication of the dispute, nor is it necessary to summon the Chamber for any other purpose. It has finally submitted that the application is wholly misconceived, and should be rejected.

4. The Indian Chamber of Commerce, by its written statement in reply dated 5th April 1965, has stated that it is not a necessary party to the dispute. It has submitted that the remuneration of the boat-crew had nothing to do with the boat-hire rates, and that any change in the remuneration of the boat-crew cannot *ipso facto* lead to any change in the boat-hire rates; that the remuneration payable to the boat-crew is a matter between the boat-owners and the boat-crew, and cannot affect the existing boat-hire rates paid or payable by the steamer agents and merchants to the boat-owners; that the boat-hire rates are those fixed between the boat-owners and steamer agents and merchants and that the Chamber has nothing to do with the remuneration payable to the boat-crew by the boat-owners; the Chamber has further stated that if any change is made in the remuneration of the boat-crew, such change cannot entitle the boat-owners to claim any change in the present boat-hire charges; that the Tribunal cannot direct any change to be made in the boat-hire rates merely because of any change which may be made in the remuneration paid or payable to the boat-crew. The Chamber has, therefore, prayed that it is not a necessary party to the dispute.

5. At a later stage on 27th November 1965, when the final arguments on the impleading petition were heard, Shri Verghese, the learned Advocate for the employers, on whose behalf the impleading petition had been made, sought to rely upon:—

- (a) copy of settlement arrived at between the boat-owners and the representatives of the Cochin Port Cargo Labour Union dated 13th June 1965.
- (b) copy of Minutes of the discussions held between the representatives of the Cochin Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Indian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the representatives of the Cochin Boat-owners' Association, dated 13th June 1965, in the

presence of the Traffic Manager, Cochin Port Trust, and the Conciliation Officer (C) Ernakulam.

- (c) (Copy of Circular No. 68/65 dated 15th June, 1965 of the Indian Chamber of Commerce, Cochin-2).
- (d) copy of the proceedings No. C.P.T./36/65 dated 10th July 1965 of the Chairman, Cochin Port Trust, Cochin-3.

In that petition, it has been urged that from these four documents and the settlement of 29th October 1965 before this Tribunal, which resulted in Award Part I in this reference, it was clear that an effective and enforceable disposal of the points that remained to be decided could be had only if the Cochin Chamber of Commerce and the Indian Chamber of Comincerse are also summoned to appear in the proceedings as parties to the dispute. It has, therefore prayed that this application be considered as a supplementary contention to the petition dated 6th November 1964, praying for the Cochin Chamber of Commerce and the Indian Chamber of Commerce to be summoned as parties to this dispute. To this supplementary application Shri Verghese has annexed the copies of the four documents relied upon him.

6. I have heard the submissions of Shri Verghese, the learned Advocate for the employers, in support of his impleading petition, and of the learned Advocates for the two Chambers, and the representatives of the Unions, in opposition thereto, and in my opinion, the petition for impleading the Cochin Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Indian Chamber of Commerce and Industry should fall for the following reasons:—

(1) There is no evidence—not even an affidavit—in support of the petition dated 6th November 1964 and the application filed on 27th November 1965 for impleading the Cochin Chamber of Commerce and the Indian Chamber of Commerce.

(2) No documents had been filed in support of the petition dated 6th November 1964 nor were the copies of the documents filed on 27th November 1965 been supplied to the representatives of the two Chambers, and all the Unions.

(3) Both the Chambers are not the employers and cannot be made parties to the industrial dispute, which is in relation to the lighterage crew.

(4) The boat-owners could at best have a civil claim against the steamship companies, as it would be a matter of contract between the boat-owners and the steamship companies.

(5) It is not the steamship companies' agents or merchants who are being impleaded, but the Chambers, of which they are members. The Chamber as such does not do business, and it is not shown what is the capacity of the Chambers to bind the steamer agents and merchants. It was not explained how the Chambers would be able to make the steamer agents and merchants pay more to the boat-crew. The fact that the Chamber in the past or at the time of the recent agreement dated 29th October 1965, played the role of mediators and even signed those agreements, would not make them a necessary party to the dispute. In my opinion, the case relied upon by Shri Verghese reported in 1964 AIR (SC) at page 1746 (Hochtief Gammon versus Industrial Tribunal) does not have any bearing on the facts of the instant case. If anything, the proper application should have been to join the steam-ship owner companies and not their Association, which has been formed only to protect the general Interests of the steamship companies and merchants, and which Chambers could, not, even if joined as parties, be made to pay the workmen the increased benefits under the Award. I, therefore, reject the impleading petition and proceed to deal with the demands on their merits.

Demand No. I.—In what manner the lighter crew should be registered?

7. The Cochin Port Cargo Labour Union, Cochin, in its written statement of claim dated 10th November, 1962, has, on this demand, stated that the question of registration of lighterage crew had been the subject-matter of adjudication by the Central Government Industrial Tribunal at Madurai in I.D. 18 (Central) of 1951, which had directed the registration of the lighterage crew, but that as machinery provided for the same did not function, the said direction has not been implemented so far. The Union has urged that the lighterage labour working under each employer is not registered with him, though for all practical purposes, they work under each employer. Because of this, the employer is completely

absolved of all responsibilities regarding security of service and the granting of other benefits to this labour, which results in manifest injustice being done to them. It has urged that security of service and permanency of employment to this labour can only be achieved by registering lighterage labour under their respective employers, the necessity for which has already been accepted by the earlier Tribunal. The Union has, therefore, urged that the Tribunal should incorporate in this award the names of the workmen under each employer, which would form the register of the lighterage labour under each employer. The Union undertook to produce a list of lighterage labour working under each of the managements at a later stage, but I may state that no such statement was filed.

8. The Cochin Thuramugha Thozhilali Union, in its written statement, has also stated that in the earlier dispute, the Madurai Industrial Tribunal had, on being satisfied with the demand, directed the registration of the boat-crew by the Administrative Committee mentioned in the schedule II of the said Award. It has stated that since that Committee did not function, this Tribunal should provide the machinery for the registration of lighterage labour. It has submitted that all the lighterage crew now working under different employers should be registered by a Board consisting of the representatives of the Government (Port), of the employers, and of the workers, represented by their Unions, specially set apart for this section of the work. It has further urged that such a Board should be vested with all the powers similar to the Dock Labour Board now functioning in the Cochin Port pertaining to the stevedore workers as envisaged by the Regulations of Employment of Dock Workers in Cochin Port.

9. The Cochin Port Thoshilali Union, in its written statement has also supported the demand on almost identical grounds as urged by the Cochin Port Thuramugha Thozhilalil Union.

10. In the written statement dated 20th February 1963 filed on behalf of the employers represented by Shri George Verghese, Advocate, who also represented the Cochin Port Boat Owners' Association, it has been stated that a number of employers mentioned therein were not parties to the Madurai Award [I.D. No. 18 (Central) of 1951] and that the Cargo-Boat owners Association of Cochin, which had signed that settlement, had gone out of existence, and there was no such Association in existence for the last 10 years. It has pointed out that a large number of the lighter owners who were parties to the settlement in I.D. 18(Central) of 1951 were stevedores as well at that time, and that that settlement was arrived at to protect the interest of the stevedores; that in spite of the directions in the Madurai Award to register the stevedore, labour, they could be registered only after the introduction of the de-casualisation scheme and the Dock Labour Board in the Port of Cochin in 1962; that it is the Dock Labour Board that has guaranteed work and other remuneration of the registered stevedore workers, and as there is no such Board as the Dock Labour Board to take up the responsibilities and liabilities that will follow from the registration of the lighterage crew, and therefore, they are not entitled to be registered. In that statement it is further urged on behalf of the employees that the lighterage crew is not permanently attached to any particular lighter, as it is the Tindal who recruits the workers who are readily available to him for the work. In the statement it is further pointed out that there would be difficulty in effecting proper registration, "as the same workers will go to one lighter at one time and to another lighter at another time"; that the matter is further complicated by the fact that the lighterage work is seasonal and purely casual. It is further pointed out that lighterage work is progressively going down due to completion of new wharves in the Port and also due to import restrictions, and, therefore, lighter owners have no work of their own, and the minimum number of days work is not guaranteed for any lighter work. It has pointed out that the work that the lighter owner may get depends on many factors such as the availability of space and accommodation on the wharves and the cargo handled by each steamer agent. There is also difference in the quantity of work handled by each lighter owner, and the crew of each lighter works on a contract basis, as prescribed in the Schedule regarding the wage rates, the crew being paid for each item of work. As an illustration, it has stated that as per the Schedule that was then in vogue, the full paid hire for 100 bags of rice not exceeding 180 pounds per bag was Rs. 16.50 paise and the share of the crew for the same work was Rs. 8/- . Besides this, the tindal got 50 paise as tindal allowance. It was also pleaded that the lighterage owners have no capacity to meet this demand.

11. In its rejoinder dated 30th January 1964, on Demand No. 1, the Cochin Port Cargo Labour Union has denied that the work of the lighter is casual, and has submitted that its work is of a perennial nature, and is part of the normal

trading activities of the Port of Cochin. It has further submitted that there is a fixed number of crew attached to each boat/boat-owner. It has further denied that the tindal recruits the crew as he likes. It has stated that the tindal only supervises the work of the said crew, and the crew is paid by the boat-owners. It has further denied that the same crew work in more than one boat. It has also denied that the boat-owners have no capacity to meet the demand.

12. At the hearing the parties have urged the same submissions as made in their respective written statements. The Cochin Port Cargo Labour Union has not filed the list of the crew on each lighter, which it had undertaken to do. There is, however, no doubt that the earlier award by the Madurai Industrial Tribunal in 1951, which was made in terms of a compromise reached between the Cargo/Boat-Owners' Association of Cochin recognises the desirability of registration of the crew on the lighters. Even if it is conceded that the tindal engages the crew, there should be no difficulty in a register being kept of the lighter crew who are engaged for work on the lighters. I do not see where the financial implication of merely maintaining a register of the lighter crew comes in. It is not possible to have a scheme of de-casualisation for these workmen as for the stevedore labour. Therefore, what I am directing is that each lighter owner will maintain a register showing the names and the particulars of (i) the name and (ii) the time when the particular member of the crew works on the particular lighter. It may, however, be noticed that a Dock Labour Board is now functioning in Cochin Port, and the registration of the names and the period when a particular crew is worked on a particular lighter would furnish the necessary material for a scheme of de-casualisation at a later stage, if one is felt necessary. Beyond giving the directions which I have given above, I do not think the Unions, have made out a case for all the demands as stated in their written statements on this issue, i.e. Issue No. 1 under reference.

Demand No. 7.—What should be the extra payment to be made to the boat crew for night duty involving no loading or unloading work?

Demand No. 9.—What should be the payment to the boat-crew for duty beyond 24 hours and beyond 48 hours?

13. These two demands were argued together at the hearing. I may state that demand No. 8 under reference which was, "what should be the extra payment of the crew for duty during night involving certain hours of work?" and demand No. 10 which was "what hours should be reckoned as the hours of night?", have been settled under terms of settlement which form the basis of my Award Part I herein, dated 4th November 1965. The Cochin Port Cargo Labour Union, in its written statement of claim dated 10th November, 1962, has on these two demands and demands Nos. 8 and 10 together urged that the workers should be deemed to have been engaged for work from the time they are ordered for work and shall be eligible for night overtime wages calculated from the time they are thus engaged, the time engaged to be directly entered in the Order Books provided for the tindals. This Union has claimed that the payment should be at the following rates:—

- (a) Bhatta at the rate of Rs. 3/- for 24 hours of engagement and thereafter @25 paise per hour per head.
- (b) Overtime rates shall be paid @ Re 1/- from 6 P.M. to 10 P.M. and at the same rate from 11 P.M. to 3 A.M.

The Union has stated that night overtime at the above rates should be payable for engagement after 6 P.M., whenever the vessel is alongside at Willingdon Island or private jetties. The hours from 6 P.M. to 6 A.M. should be reckoned as night hours. Overtime rates are asked for work during night hours, which are recognised as more hazardous than during day time. It has pointed out that even now for work during fixed intervals inconvenience money is paid.

14. The Cochin Thuramugha Thozhilali Union has on demand No. 7 urged that the workers should be deemed to have been engaged for work from the time they are ordered for work against the existing practice of treating the work to have commenced when the loading or unloading starts. This Union has claimed that the bhatta should be increased from Rs. 1.25 to Rs. 3.00 per head. On demand No. 9 this Union has stated that the workers should be enabled to get a detention charge of Rs. 5/- per head for work beyond the first 24 hours and within the first 48 hours. The crew should be also entitled to get a demurrage charge of Rs. 7.50 for work beyond the first 48 hours and within 72 hours.

16. In its written statement of claim dated 8th January 1963, the Cochin Port Thozhilali Union has urged the same arguments in support of these two demands as has been urged by the Cochin Port Thuramugha Thozhilali Union.

16. The employers in their written statement dated 20th February, 1963 above referred to, have on demand No. 7 stated that the pre-award rate is Rs. 1.25 per crew for a full night. This payment was made only for the time spent by the crew alongside the vessel during night. This rate was not affected by the earlier award, and the boat-owners get only this amount from their principals. It has submitted that this rate cannot be revised unless the boat-owners also get a corresponding increase. The amounts claimed by the Unions under this head, should, therefore, not be allowed. With regard to demand No. 9, these employers have urged that for duty beyond 24 hours, the boat-crew is now being paid Rs. 2/- per head, and for duty beyond 48 hours, the boat-crew is being paid Rs. 1-10-0 per head additional. It has stated that this amount of Rs. 2/- is not being reimbursed to the owners of the lighters in spite of it having been claimed in correspondence between the boat-owners and the port authorities. It has, however, stated that the second amount of Rs. 1-10-0 per head for work beyond 48 hours i.e. being reimbursed to a small extent as demurrage. The employers have urged on demand No. 9 that for a trip which will usually be over in about 48 hours i.e. being reimbursed to a small extent as demurrage. The employers remunerations of the other workers working in this area. It has urged that the present rates of payment for duty beyond 24 hours and beyond 48 hours is already very high, and the workers are not justified in demanding an increase in those rates. It has finally urged that even if higher revised rates are ordered, it should be subject to a corresponding revision in the rates that the management get from their principals under this head, and that the owners have no capacity to pay anything more under this head.

17. The employers have urged at the hearing that the present rate is Rs. 1.25 per crew for the full night, and that this rate was fixed even prior to the Madurai Award, and that the boat-owners are compensated for this by their principals. But the point is that for over 10 years now, there has been no revision of this rate. There is little doubt that wages and rates of payment in the Port of Cochin and elsewhere have gone up since then. There has been a considerable rise in the cost of living during the last ten years and wage rates fixed more than 15 years ago cannot be said to provide even a minimum under present conditions. The owners of the lighters have not denied that there is a case and justification for increasing the said existing rates. But what they plead is that they have no capacity to pay the same and unless their principals compensate them for the increased rates, they would not be able to bear the financial burden of the increase in rates which may be granted. After hearing the submissions of the parties, I am satisfied that at least a 50% increase in the existing rate of Rs. 1.25 is justified, and I award the same. Under the agreement on which my Part I award is based, there has been an agreed increase of 50% in the existing rates allowed, and I would be justified in adopting the same rate of increase in the existing rate under demand No. 7.

18. With regard to demand No. 9, the rate for work beyond 24 hours is Rs. 2/- per head, and the rate for duty beyond 48 hours is Rs. 1-10-0 per head additional. The employers have stated that for the first payment of Rs. 2/- they are not being reimbursed by their principals, but that they are being reimbursed to a certain extent for the second payment of Rs. 1-10-0. Whatever that may be, there is no doubt that there is a case and justification for increasing these rates. I feel that an increase in the rates by 50% would be justified considering that under the agreement forming the basis of Award Part I herein, the increase in the other rates is also of the order of 50%. With regard to working hours, I accept Shri Menon's contention that the working hours should count from the time the lighter is handed over to the crew, i.e. from the actual time of engagement, till the time of disengagement. The next question to consider on these two demands is the date from which the revised payments should be made. The agreement forming the basis of Award Part I provided for the increases being granted from 1st January, 1965. The Unions have stated that the benefit of the Award on these demands should be granted from a much earlier date, considering that the dispute was originally referred in 1962. but, in my opinion, any date earlier than 1st June, 1965, would be impractical, and would impose too heavy a burden on the employers. I, therefore, direct that the increased rates awarded herein shall be effective from 1st June 1965, and shall be paid to the crew concerned within one month from the date this Award becomes enforceable.

Demand No. 13.—What should be the rate of surcharge for trips to places such as Eloor, Kundra, Four Berths, etc.?

The Cochin Port Cargo Labour Union has demanded an increase in the existing rates as follows:-

Four Berths	20%
Eloor, Alupuram and Kundra	50%

19. The Cochin Port Thozhilali Union in its written statement of claim dated 8th January 1963, has, on this demand, urged that the surcharge for trips to Four Berths be enhanced to 25% and to Eloor, Kundra and Alupuram to 50%.

20. The Cochin Thuramugha Thozhilali Union, in its written statement of claim on this demand has made the same claim as has been made by the Cochin Port Thozhilali Union.

21. The employers, in the written statement on this demand, have stated that Kundra and Eloor are outside the limits of the Cochin Port, and the existing rates paid for trips to these two places are reasonable; that Four Berths is within the port limit and there is no justification for any increase in the existing surcharge for Four Berths, because no extra charge is paid for transporting the cargo to places like Vypun or Candle Island, which are further away than Four Berths. It has, therefore, stated that the demand for increase in surcharge for any of these places is not justified.

22. At the hearing it was stated that in view of the settlement reached with the employer No. 61, the demand for extra payment for trips to Kundra is dropped. Therefore the demand only survives with regard to Eloor and Four Berths. With regard to the claim for enhancement of the surcharge for the Four Berths, it was explained that originally there were only four berths on the western side of Willingdon Island, and the lead was from there to the Cochin side of the Mattancherry Channel. However, four new berths have been opened on the eastern side of Willingdon Island. From the Four Berths on the western side to go to the Four Berths on the eastern side, a semi-circular round from the northern side of Willingdon Island has to be covered. This, according to the Unions, reduces the turnover of loading and unloading work on the Four Berths by half. It is, therefore, that the Union claims that they should be compensated by payment of surcharge of 20% of the revised rate. With regard to the claim for surcharge for Eloor, it was explained that Eloor is in Udyog Mandal, where the fertiliser factories are situated. Mainly bulk cargo is handled, the rates for handling which cargo are negotiated rates on par with other scheduled rates. For certain other bulk cargo like sulphur nitrate, special rates are fixed, taking into consideration the nature of the cargo, and not in relation to the distance travelled. The Unions have stated that they want a 50% surcharge. The distance to Alupuram is two miles from Four Berths. Shri Kochunny for the Cochin Port Thuramugha Thozhilali Union, has claimed that the 50% surcharge which they had claimed should be on the revised rates. Shri Verghese, appearing for the employers, has urged that the surcharge is always paid by the principals, which is 10% of the basic rate. He said that the lighter-owners were prepared to pay the surcharge for the Four Berths provided the employers' steamer agents and merchants increase the rates. He has stated that there should be a revision of the boat-hire schedule regarding Four Berths. With regard to Eloor where the F.A.C.T. factory is situated, Shri Verghese stated that only two employers are interested in this work. Wherever there was a surcharge, there was a basic-rate of wages also, but with regard to Eloor, as there is a fixed over-all rate, there is no separate surcharge. Shri Verghese further stated that until 1st June 1965 this rate was Rs. 3/- per tonne. Under the revised rates which have come into force from 1st June 1965, the employers have agreed to pay Rs. 4/- per tonne. He further stated on 27th November 1965 that only in the previous week, one of the employers had agreed to pay 50 paise more per tonne, thus bringing the present rate to Rs. 4.50 per tonne. Shri Verghese has, however, argued that the demand for 50% increase in surcharge is not justified.

23. Shri Kurian, the counsel for the New Dholera Shipping and Trading Company Ltd. (Employer No. 56) submitted that his company would be paying such enhanced rates as the Tribunal thinks reasonable. He did not support Shri Verghese's contention that the increase in rates should be granted only if the principals grant a corresponding increase to the boat-owners. Though the New Dholera Shipping and Trading Company does not evidently handle any cargo at Eloor, Kundra and Alupuram, Shri Kurian raised the objection as to the Tribunal's jurisdiction to entertain any demand with regard to payment for work at these

places, because, according to him, they were not major ports, and therefore, this Tribunal had no jurisdiction to entertain an industrial dispute with regard to work there. What Shri Kurian has, however, overlooked is that Sec. 2(a) of the Act speaks of an industrial dispute "concerning a major port". The term "concerning a major port" has come in for judicial interpretation, and it has been construed as meaning "activities relating to a major port". (See Award dated 29th September 1965 in Reference No. CGIT-41 of 1964) in the industrial dispute between Messrs. D. D. Contractor and Their Workmen, published by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment's Notification dated 20th October 1965. Now, it is not denied that the cargo from Cochin Port is carried to these two places. It cannot, therefore, be said that the loading and unloading activities at Eloor and Kundra and Alupuram are not activities concerning a major port, i.e., the major port of Cochin. I may state that other employers have not raised this objection. I am satisfied that an increase in the surcharge for the Four Berths is justified. As on the other demands, Shri Verghese's contention is not so much that the increase in the existing rate of surcharge is not justified, but his contention is that the boat-owners should not be asked to pay this enhanced rate unless their principals reimburse them fully. This is not the attitude taken by the New Dholera Shipping and Trading Company. At present, the surcharge for the Four Berths is 10% of the basic rate, and I would direct that this be increased to 15% of the basic rate. With regard to demand for Eloor and Kundra, the demand for enhanced rate for Kundra was given up because an independent agreement has been entered into with the boat-owners, whose boats ply there. (viz. Employer No. 61). Therefore, the only claim that remains is for Eloor. Now, with regard to Eloor, there is no separate surcharge and the rate was Rs. 3/- per ton, which under the revision granted under the agreement forming the basis of my Award Part I herein, has been raised to Rs. 4.00 per tonne, with effect from 1st June 1965. There was a further increase of Re. 0.50 per tonne, bringing the present rate to Rs. 4.50 per tonne. In view of this, the demand for an increase by 50% is virtually conceded, because the rate has gone up from Rs. 3/- to Rs. 4.50 per tonne. I, therefore, award that for the work at Eloor, there shall be a 50% increase as stated above, with effect from 1st June 1965.

Demand No. 14.—What should be the rate of Tindal allowance?

24. The Cochin Port Cargo Labour Union, in its statement of claim, has in support of this demand, stated that the duties of the tindal are responsible and he is therefore, at present, paid 6½% of the gross share of the basic rates paid from the share of the boat-owner, as additional payment, over and above the equal share he is entitled to get along with the lascars. This is paid by the boat-owner. This Union has urged that the tindal being in charge of the boat, discharges responsible duties and should be paid an allowance commensurate with his duties and responsibilities. It has, therefore, claimed that the tindal allowance should be increased to 12½% additional of the gross share to be paid to him by the boat-owner from his share. The Cochin Thuramuga Thozhilali Union and the Cochin Port Thozhilali Union have both in their written statements claimed that the tindal allowance should be raised to 12½% of the boat-hire over and above the equal share he is entitled to get along with the lascars. The employers in their written statement dated 20th February 1963 have on this demand stated that the allowance at 6½% of the gross share of the boat-hire, which the tindal is now being paid, is reasonable. It has stated that the statement made by the Cochin Port Cargo Labour Union that the allowance rate paid to the tindal is 6½% of the gross share of the basic rates paid from the share of the boat-owner and by him, is incorrect. It has again pleaded that any increase in the tindal allowance, if found necessary, should be subject to a corresponding increase in the boat-hire of the management. At the hearing on 27th November 1965, the Unions reiterated their claims for an increase in the existing rate of tindal allowance to 12½% of the gross share of the boat-owners. Shri Verghese, however, stated at the hearing that since 1st June 1965, the tindal is being paid at 75 paise for standard 100 bags. This rate is being paid since the revised rates came into force from 1st June 1965. Shri T. C. N. Menon was inclined to challenge this statement, and he stated that some owners are not paying at that rate. Shri Kochunny for the Cochin Thuramuga Thozhilali Union stated that to his knowledge, all the boat-owners were paying at the rate of 75 paise for 100 bags since the revised rates were introduced on 1st June 1965, but that the rate remained the same, i.e. 6½% of the basic wage. In my opinion, what the boat-owners are paying to the tindal as tindal allowance since 1st June 1965 appears to be fair and reasonable, and that allowance is 75 paise for standard 100 bags. From what was stated at the hearing, it appears that the tindals have accepted this rate, which is being paid by the boat-owners without any exception. I, therefore, award

that the tindal allowance shall be Re. 0.75 paise for standard 100 bags, and that the same shall be paid with effect from 1st June 1965.

25. No order as to costs.

(Sd.) SALIM M. MERCHANT,

Presiding Officer.

[No. 28/62/62-LRIV.]

New Delhi, the 11th February 1966

S.O. 509.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Pyarchand Modi Ramchandra, owners of Bhura Mica Mines Post Office Jhumri Telaiya, and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 31st January, 1966.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT
DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) of The Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

REFERENCE NO. 14 OF 1965

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of M/s. Pyarchand Modi Ramchandra.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT:

Sri Raj Kishore Prasad, M.A., B.L.—*Presiding Officer.*

APPEARANCES.

For the Employers.—Sri N. Das Gupta, Agent.

For the Workmen.—Sri Asho Barhi, workman *in person*, Sri Yasraj Singh, President and Sri Bhuneshwar Singh, General Secretary, Abhrak Mazdoor Panchayat.

STATE: Bihar.

INDUSTRY: Mica.

Dhanbad, dated the 13th January, 1966.

AWARD

By its order No. 20/17/64-L.R.I, dated the 16th January, 1965, the Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment, referred to this Tribunal for adjudication an industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Pyarchand Modi Ramchandra, owners of Bhura Mica Mines, P.O. Jhumri Telaiya and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the schedule annexed to the order of the reference, which are reproduced below:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of M/s. Pyarchand Modi Ramchandra, owners of Bhura Mica Mine, Jhumri Telaiya is justified in refusing to employ from the 9th November, 1964 Shri Asho Barhi a carpenter employed in their Bhura Mica Mines? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?".

2. To suit the convenience of the parties the case was fixed for hearing at D.V.C. Circuit House at Telaiya Dam on 10th January, 1966, when both the parties were represented. The management was represented by Shri N. Das Gupta, the Agent and the concerned workman was represented by himself *in person* and also by his union—Abhrak Mazdoor Panchayat, which was represented by Sarvashri Yasraj Singh, President and Bhuneshwar Singh, General Secretary.

3. All the parties concerned in the dispute filed a joint petition of compromise on 10th January, 1966, signed by all the aforesaid four persons and prayed that

an award in terms of the said compromise, which is marked Annexure 'A', be passed.

4. According to the compromise the management agreed that the concerned workman Shri Asho Barhi will be re-instated to his previous job in Bhura Mica Mines of the management; that he will be paid Rs. 25 only as *ex-gratia* provided he reports for duty on 25th January, 1966; that he will have continuity of service and that he will not be entitled to any other compensation for the unemployed period.

5. I have read the terms of the compromise, which was signed in my presence by all the four aforesaid persons, including the concerned workman, who put his left thumb impression on it and considered all the terms of the compromise and in my opinion, they are fair, reasonable and in the interest of both the parties and, therefore, accept the compromise and record it, as prayed for by the parties.

6. The reference is accordingly disposed of in terms of the compromise, Annexure 'A', and an award in terms of it is passed and the said compromise, Annexure 'A', is made a part of the award.

7. This is the award which I make and submit to the Central Government under Section 15 of the Act.

Presiding Officer,
Central Government Industrial Tribunal,
Dhanbad.

ANNEXURE "A"

MEMORANDUM OF SETTLEMENT ARRIVED AT JHUMRI TELAIYA ON 10TH JANUARY, 1966 IN THE MATTER OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE BETWEEN THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. PYARCHAND MODI RAMCHANDRA, JHUMRI TELAIYA, DISTRICT HAZARIBAGH AND THEIR WORKMEN REPRESENTED BY ABHRAK MAZDOOR PANCHAYAT, JHUMRI TELAIYA, DIST. HAZARIBAGH.

Representing Employer.—Sri N. Das Gupta, Agent, M/s. Pyarchand Modi Ramchandra, P. O. Jhumri Telaiya, Dist. Hazaribagh.

Representing workmen.—(1) Sri Yasraj Singh, President Abhrak Mazdoor Panchayat

&

(2) Sri Bhuneshwar Singh, General Secretary, Abhrak Mazdoor Panchayat, P.O. Jhumri Telaiya, Dist., Hazaribagh.

(3) Workman, Sri Asho Barhi.

Short Recital.

In Reference No. 14 of 1965 of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad in the matter of refusal of employment to Sri Asho Barhi an ex-employee of Bhura Mica Mines of the above employer the following settlement was arrived at.

Terms of Settlement

It is agreed that Sri Asho Barhi will be re-instated to his previous job in Bhura Mica Mines of the management. He will be paid Rs. 25 only as *ex-gratia* provided he reports on duty on 25th January, 1966. He will have continuity of

service. He will not be entitled to any other compensation for the unemployed period.

Witness:—

For and on behalf of the Employer
M/s. Pyarchand Modi Ramchandra.

N. DAS GUPTA,
Agent.
10-1-1966.

For and on behalf of the Abrakh Mazdoor Panchayat.

यशराज सिंह
(YASRAJ SINGH),
President.
10-1-1966.

For and on behalf of the Abrakh Mazdoor Panchayat.

भृवनेश्वर सिंह
(BHUVNESHWAR SINGH)
General Secretary
Abrakh Mazdoor Panchayat.
10-1-1966.

बायां हाथ का निशानी माधो बड़ीग्र

10-1-1966.

[No. 20/17/64-LRI.]

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 8th February 1966

S.O. 510.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the East Indian Coal Company Limited, Post Office Jealgora, District Dhanbad, and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the termination of services of Shri S. R. Tewary, Clerk, Accounts Office, with effect from the 2nd March, 1965, by the management of the East Indian Coal Company Limited, was justified? If not, to what relief is the workmen entitled?

[No. 2/4/66-LRII.]

New Delhi, the 10th February 1966

S.O. 511.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Shahdara (Delhi) Saharanpur Light Railway Co., Ltd., and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Delhi constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

1. Whether the demand of the workmen employed by the Shahdra (Delhi) Saharanpur Light Railway Co. Ltd., for payment of bonus equivalent to two months wages for the years ending of 31st March, 1962, the 31st March, 1963 and the 31st March, 1964 is justified?

2. If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?

[No. 2/28/65/LRIV.]

New Delhi, the 11th February 1966

S.O. 512.—Whereas an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Guali Iron Mine of Messrs M. H. Rahman and their workmen represented by the Keonjhar Mines and Forest Workers Union (hereinafter referred to as the Union);

And whereas the said employers and the Union have by a written agreement, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), referred the said dispute to arbitration of the person mentioned therein, and a copy of the said arbitration agreement has been forwarded to the Central Government;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (3) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the said arbitration agreement, which was received by the Central Government on the 27th January, 1966.

Agreement

(Under Section 10-A of the Industrial dispute Act, 1947),

Representing Employers:—

Shri Dhurba Charan Sahu, Manager,
Guali Iron Mine of M/s. M. H.
Rahman,

Representing workmen:

Shri H. Behera, General Secretary
Keonjher Mines and Forest
workers Union BARBIL.

It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the following industrial dispute to the arbitration of Shri N. K. Chadha, Regional Labour Commissioner (C), Calcutta.

(i) Specific matters in dispute:

"Whether termination of services of workmen detailed below by the management of M/s. M. H. Rahman, Owners in relation to Guali Iron Mine, P.O. Guali, District Keonjhar, with effect from 13th October, 1965 was legal and justified?

If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?

The names and designations of the workmen concerned are given below:—

1. Shri Jatta Gope, Miner.
2. Smt. Ballama Dei, Miner.
3. Shri Bika Munda, Miner.
4. Smt. Made Dei, Miner.
5. Shri Pradhan Munda, Miner.
6. Smt. Jano Dei, Miner.
7. Shri Ruttai Munda, Miner.
8. Smt. Nandi Dei, Miner.
9. Shri Gomia Munda, Miner.
10. Smt. Katamai Dei, Miner.
11. Shri Lukuna Munda, Miner.
12. Smt. Champa Dei, Miner.
13. Shri Arjuna Munda, Miner.
14. Smt. Kitamai Dei, Miner.
15. Shri Durbasingh Munda, Miner.
16. Smt. Rundai Dei, Miner.

(ii) Details of the parties to the dispute including the name and address of the establishment or undertaking involved:

M/s. M. H. Rahman and their workmen in Guali Iron Mine. Name of the Establishment: Guali Iron Mine, P.O. Guali, District Keonjhar.

(iii) Name of the Union, if any, representing the workmen in question:

Keonjhar Miners and Forest Workers' Union, P.O. Barbil, District Keonjhar.

(iv) Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking affected: 70.

(v) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute: 16.

(vi) The arbitrator shall make his award within a period of 3 (three) months or within such further time as is extended by mutual agreement between us in writing. In case the award is not made within the period aforementioned, the reference to arbitration shall stand automatically cancelled and we shall be free to negotiate for fresh arbitration.

Representative of Employers.

Sd./- D. C. SAHU,

15-1-1966.

Manager,

Guali Iron Mine.

Sd./ H. BEHERA,
15-1-1966.

Witnesses:

1. Sd./- M. HANIF.

2. Sd./- K. C. JENA.

1. Sd./- K. C. PRADHAN;

2. Sd./- DURGA MOHAN..

[No. 37/46/65-LR. I.]

S.O. 513.—Whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Bhowra Colliery, Post Office Bhowra, District Dhanbad, and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the management of the Bhowra Colliery was justified in terminating the services of Shri Khublal Saw, M.C. Loader, with effect from the 6th December, 1965? If not, to what relief is the workmen entitled?

[No. 2/15/66-LR. II.]

S.O. 514.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Chanch Colliery of Messrs. Andrew Yule and Company Limited, Post Office Chirkunda, District Dhanbad, and the Coalfields Recruiting Organisation of the one part and their workmen of the other part, in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed.

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the transfer of Shri Narendra Singh, Assistant Supervisor, from the Chanch Colliery of Messrs Andrew Yule and Company Limited to Bird's Saunda Colliery with effect from the 20th August, 1965, and the termination of his services with effect from the 17th September, 1965, were justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled and from whom?

[No. 2/6/66-LR-II.]

S.O. 515.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Toposi Colliery, Post Office Toposi, District Burdwan, and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the dismissal of Shri Pardeshi Harijan, Pick Miner, by the management of the Toposi Colliery with effect from the 7th January, 1965, was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. 6/47/65/LRII.]

S.O. 516.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an Industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Mandamari and Ramakrishnapur Divisions of Singareni Collieries Company, Limited, Belampalli Post Office (A.P.) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal, with Shri Mohammad Najmuddin as the Presiding Officer, with Headquarters at Hyderabad, and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited is justified in reducing the strength of Coal Cutters from five to four in a gang in their new mines in the Mandamari Division including the Ramakrishnapur area?

If not, to what relief are the Coal Cutters entitled?

[No. 7/31/65-LRII.]

H. C. MANGHANI, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 10th February 1966

S.O. 517.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints the following Labour Enforcement Officers to be Inspectors in addition to the Conciliation Officers (Central) (now designated as Assistant Labour Commissioners) at the Ports mentioned against them for the purposes of the said Act namely:—

1. All Labour Enforcement Officers, Bombay.—Bombay Port.
2. All Labour Enforcement Officers, Calcutta.—Calcutta Port.
3. All Labour Enforcement Officers, Madras.—Madras Port.
4. Labour Enforcement Officer, Ernakulam.—Cochin Port.
5. Labour Enforcement Officer, Visakhapatnam.—Vizagapatam Port.
6. Labour Enforcement Officer, Vasco-da-Gama.—Mormugao Port.

[No. 628/199/65-Fac.]

K. D. HAJELA, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT & REHABILITATION
(Department of Labour and Employment)

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 11th February 1966

S.O. 518.—In the amendment affected *vide* Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 3996 dated 10th November 1964 published on page 4443 in Part II, Section 3 Sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India dated 21st November, 1964 for “Shri M. Kota Reddy” read “Shri P. Kota Reddy”.

[No. 23(3)61-MIII.]

B. K. SAKSENA, Under Secy.

(Department of Rehabilitation)

(Office of the Chief Settlement Commissioner)

New Delhi, the 8th February 1966

S.O. 519.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (i) of Section (6) of the Administration of the Evacuee Property Act, 1950 (XXXI of 1950), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri J. R. Bhanot, Superintendent in the office of Custodian of Evacuee Property, Jullundur, as Assistant Custodian for the State of Punjab for the purpose of discharging the duties assigned to the Custodian of Evacuee Property by or under the said Act with effect from 7th February, 1966.

[No. F. 7(42)ARG/60.]

A. G. VASWANI,
 Settlement Commissioner (A) &
 Ex-Officio Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

ORDER

STAMPS

New Delhi, the 19th February 1966

S.O. 520.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899) and in supersession of late Finance Department (Central Revenues) notification No. 6 dated the 14th August, 1937, the Central Government hereby reduces the duty with which the instruments described in paragraph 9 are chargeable to the extent specified herein, and remits the duties chargeable in respect of the instruments described in the remaining paragraphs, namely:—

(1) Receipt endorsed by the payee on a Postal Money Order or given by the payee to the Post Office for a sum paid to him in adjustment of a short or wrong payment of such an Order;

(2) Receipt obtained in respect of payment of amount due on a Post Office Cash Certificate whether endorsed on the back of the certificate at the time of its discharge or taken separately;

(3) Receipt given by an officer of the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department in respect of a sum paid to him by the Central Government as advance for the purchase of Railway or Steamer tickets;

(4) Receipt or Bill or Lading issued by a Railway Administration or an Inland Steamer Company for the fare for the conveyance of passengers or goods, or both, or animals or for any charges incidental to the conveyance thereof or given to such an administration or Inland Steamer Company for the refund of an over-charge made in respect of such fare or charges;

(5) Receipt given by a Railway Administration or an Inland Steamer Company for money received by it from another Railway Administration or Inland Steamer Company or from a Tramway Company or other carrying Company on account of its share of fares or freight for the conveyance in through traffic of passengers or goods or both or of animals;

(6) Receipt given for pension or allowances paid by the Central Government to an heir of a deceased non-commissioned officer or petty officer, soldier, sailor or airman of Land, Naval or Air Forces;

(7) Receipt given for payment of interest on Government of India Promissory Notes;

(8) Receipt or bill of lading issued by the Commercial Carrying Company Limited, for the fare for the conveyance of passengers or goods or both or receipt given by the said Company for the refund of overcharge made in respect of such fare; and

(9) Proxy empowering a person to vote at a meeting of creditors duty reduced to the rate chargeable on a proxy empowering a person to vote at any one meeting of members of an incorporated Company.

[No. 5/66-Stamps/F. No. 1/20/61-Cus.VII.]

M. G. VAIDYA, Under Secy.

**MINISTRY OF INFORMATION & BROADCASTING
ORDER**

New Delhi, the 5th February 1966

S.O. 521.—In pursuance of the Directions issued under the provisions of the enactments specified in the First Schedule annexed hereto the Central Government after considering the recommendations of the Film Advisory Board, Bombay hereby approves the film specified in column 2 of the Second Schedule annexed hereto in all its language versions to be of the description specified against it in column 6 of the said Second Schedule.

THE FIRST SCHEDULE

- (1) Sub-Section (4) of the Section 12 and Section 16 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (Central Act XXXVII of 1952).
- (2) Sub-Section (3) of Section 5 and Section 9 of the Bombay Cinemas (Regulation) Act, 1953 (Bombay Act XI of 1953).
- (3) Sub-Section (4) of Section 5 and Section 9 of the Saurashtra Cinemas (Regulation) Act, 1953 (Saurashtra Act XVII of 1953).

THE SECOND SCHEDULE

S. No.	Title of the Film	Length 35 mm	Name of the Applicant	Name of the Producer	Whether a scientific film or a film intended for educational purposes or a film dealing with news and current events or documentary film
1	2	3	4	5	6
I	MAHARASHTRA NEWS No. 164.	1303·28 M	Director of Publicity, Govt. of Maharashtra, Bombay.		Film dealing with news and current events (For release in Maharashtra Circuit only.)

[No. F. 24/1/66-FP. App.1064.]

B. GHOSE, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY & SUPPLY

(Department of Industry)

(Indian Standards Institution)

New Delhi, the 1st February 1966

S.O. 522—In pursuance of the provisions of sub-rule (2) of rule 3 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks), Rules, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Indian Standards, particulars of which are given in the schedule hereto annexed, have been established during the quarter ending 31 December 1965.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. of Indian Standard	Title of Indian Standard
1	IS : 130-1964	Specification for ready mixed paint, spraying, finishing, for railway wagon stock, to Indian Standard colour no. 446, red oxide, and red oxide (colour unspecified) (revised).
2	IS : 360-1965	Specification for electric radiators (revised).
3	IS : 444-1964	Specification for water hose of rubber, low pressure with woven reinforcement (revised).
4	IS : 446-1964	Specification for air hose of rubber, light duty, with woven reinforcement (revised).
5	IS : 447-1964	Specification for welding and cutting hose of rubber with woven reinforcement (revised).
6	IS : 552-1965	Specification for smith bits (revised).
7	IS : 697-1965	Code of practice for construction of bagged food grain storage structures suitable for trade and government purposes (revised).
8	IS : 641-1964	Specification for ready mixed paint brushing, finishing, interior, semi-gloss, for general purposes, white (revised).
9	IS : 779-1965	Specification for water meters (domestic type) (second revision).
10	IS : 1155-1965	Specification for wheat atta (revised).
11	IS : 1232-1964	Specification for ready mixed paint, brushing, yellow ochre, semi-gloss, for general purposes (revised).
12]	IS : 1253-1965	Specification for aluminium shot for use in iron and steel manufacture (revised).
13	IS : 1264-1965	Specification for brass ingots for gravity dye castings and brass gravity dye castings (including naval brass) (revised).
14	IS : 1322-1965	Specification for bitumen felts for waterproofing and damp-proofing (revised).
15]	IS : 1339-1965	Specification for lead alloys for sheathing of electric cables (revised).
16	IS : 1342-1964	Specification for oil pressure stoves (revised).
17	IS : 1384-1964	Specification for oil pressure lanterns (revised).
18	IS : 1885 (Part VIII)-1965	Electrotechnical vocabulary Part VIII secondary cells and batteries.
19]	IS : 2254-1965	Dimensions of vertical shaft motors for pumps (revised).
20	IS : 2363-1965	Glossary of terms relating to wire ropes.
21	IS : 2385-1965	Specification for hot-rolled mild steel strip for cold-reduced tinplate.
22	IS : 2399-1964	Glossary of terms relating to rolling bearings.
23	IS : 2541-1965	Code of practice for use of lime concrete in buildings.
24	IS : 2848-1965	Specification for platinum resistance thermometer elements.
25	IS : 2895-1965	Specification for wooden handles for engineers' files.

Sl. No.	No. of Indian Standard	Title of Indian Standard
26	IS : 2932-1964 . . .	Specification for enamel, synthetic, exterior, Type 1(a) undercoating, (b) finishing colour as required.
27	IS : 2933-1964 . . .	Specification for enamel, exterior, Type 2, (a) under-coating, (b) finishing, colour as required
28	IS : 2934 (Part I)-1964 . . .	Specification for non-wire-wound variable resistors (potentiometers) Type 2 Part I Tests and general requirements.
29	IS : 3005-1964 . . .	Specification for grey cast iron ingot moulds, stools and slag ladles.
30	IS : 3010 (Part I)-1965 . . .	Specification for appliance-connectors and appliance-inlets (non-reversible three-pin type) Part I Appliance-connectors.
31	IS : 3010 (Part II)-1965 . . .	Specification for appliance-connectors and appliance-inlets (non-reversible three-pin type) Part II Appliance-inlets.
32	IS : 3011-1965 . . .	Specification for ferro zirconium.
33	IS : 3012-1965 . . .	Specification for chrome manganese.
34	IS : 3013-1965 . . .	Specification for ferro boron.
35	IS : 3019-1965 . . .	Specification for high speed steel single point turning tools.
36	IS : 3035 (Part I)-1965 . . .	Specification for thermoplastic insulated weather-proof cables. Part I PVC insulated and PVC sheathed.
37	IS : 3035 (Part II)-1965 . . .	Specification for thermoplastic insulated weather-proof cables. Part II Polythene insulated, taped, braided and compounded,
38	IS : 3058-1965 . . .	Code of practice for fire safety of industrial buildings Viscose rayon yarn and/or staple fibre plants.
39	IS : 3062-1965 . . .	Specification for rocker sprayer.
40	IS : 3084-1965 . . .	Specification for pencil slats.
41	IS : 3091-1965 . . .	Specification for aluminium bronze ingots and castings for overhead fittings in electric traction.
42	IS : 3107-1965 . . .	Specification for veneered particle boards.
43	IS : 3102-1965 . . .	Classification of bricks.
44	IS : 3109-1965 . . .	Specification for electrically welded steel chain, short link and pitched or calibrated, grade 40, for lifting purposes.
45	IS : 3110-1965 . . .	Specification for silver leaf.
46	IS : 3125-1965 . . .	Specification for seeds of capsicum.
47	IS : 3126-1965 . . .	Specification for seeds of cucumber.
48	IS : 3127-1965 . . .	Specification for seeds of onion.
49	IS : 3128-1965 . . .	Specification of seeds of lettuce.
50	IS : 3143-1965 . . .	Specification for cotton ropes for power transmission.
51	IS : 3152-1965 . . .	Specification for needle files.
52	IS : 3153-1965 . . .	Specification for thresher, olpad type.
53	IS : 3158-1965 . . .	Specification for aluminium cylindrical silver cans for spinning mills.
54	IS : 3165-1965 . . .	Specification for weaver's beams for use in plain calico looms.
55	IS : 3168-1965 . . .	Specification for brass strip and foil for deep drawing.
56	IS : 3178-1965 . . .	Specification for abrasive emery grain.
57	IS : 3197-1965 . . .	Specification for onions.
58	IS : 3235-1965 . . .	General requirements for syringes for medical use.
59	IS : 3262-1965 . . .	Specification for pilot lead line.
60	IS : 3309-1965 . . .	Specification for soluble French coffee powder.
61	IS : 3316-1965 . . .	Method of sampling and grading structural granite.

New Delhi, the 2nd February 1966

S.O. 523.—In licence No. CM/L-997 dated 25 Jan. 1965 held by M/s. Omega Insulated Cable Co. (India) Ltd., Madras, the details of which are published under S.O. 667 in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated 27 February 1965, the list of articles has been revised as under with effect from 27 December 1965:

Type	Voltage	Grade	Conductor
<i>PVC Insulated Cables.</i>			
(i) Single core (unsheathed)	250/440 volts	A mm	only.
(ii) Single core (unsheathed)	650/1100 volts	Copper or	
(iii) Single core (PVC sheathed)	250/440 volts	Aluminium	

[No. MD/12:18670.]

New Delhi, the 3rd February 1966

S.O. 524.—In pursuance of regulation 4 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations 1955 the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that amendment(s) to the Indian Standard(s) given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been issued under the powers conferred by sub-regulation (1) of regulation 3 of the said regulations.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. and title of the Indian Standard amended	No. and Date of Gazette Notification in which the establishment of the Indian Standard was notified.	No. and Date of the Amendment	Brief particulars of the Amendment	Date from which the Amendment shall have effect
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	IS: 317-1959 Specification for general service automotive hydraulic brake fluid (revised)	S.O. 1463 dated 11 June 1960.	No. 2 November 1965.	Clauses F-1. 1 and H-2. 1 have been amended.	
2.	IS: 398-1961 Specification for hard-drawn stranded aluminium and steel-cored aluminium conductors for overhead power transmission purposes (revised).	S.O. 417 dated 10 February 1962.	No. 1 November 1965.	(i) Clauses 8.1, 8.2, 14.2.3 and Tables III & IIIA have been amended. (ii) Clauses 12. 1, 13. 1 and 13. 2 have been substituted by new ones. (iii) A new clause 4.1. 1 and new values in Tables I, IA, II, IIIA, IV and IVB have been added.	
3.	IS: 412-1962 Specification for expanded metal steel sheets for general purposes (revised).	S.O. 2838 dated 15 September 1962.	No. 2 September 1965.	A new clause 5. 2. 3 has been added after 5. 2. 1.	15 February 1966.
4.	IS: 482-1962 Reels for covered, solid, round electrical winding wires (revised).	S.O. 483 dated 16 February 1963.	No. 1 November 1965.	Table I and II have been amended.	
5.	IS: 591-1964 Specification for mains transformers for electronic equipment (revised).	S.O. 2042 dated 26 June 1965.	No. 1 September 1965.	(i) Page 2, under the column 'Representing' lines 11 and 12—	

Substitute 'Chief Inspectorate of Electronics (Ministry of Defence), Bangalore' for 'Chief Inspectorate of Electronics (Ministry of Civil Aviation), Bangalore'.

6. IS: 703-1956 Specification for axes.

S.R.O. 2423 dated
27 July 1957.

No. 1
November 1965.

7. IS: 807 (Part I)—1963 Code of practice for design, manufacture, erection and testing of cranes.

Part I Structural portion.

S.O. 415 dated
1 February 1964.

No. 1
November 1965.

- (ii) Clauses 3.2, 4.1.2, 8.1.1, 8.1.2, 8.1.3, 8.3.2, 9.10.3.2, 15.2.4, 15.4, 16.2 and 16.3 have been amended.
- (iii) Clauses 4.1.1, 7.1 to 7.3 and 14.3.2 have been substituted by new ones.
- (iv) Clause 9.11 and Appendix B have been deleted.
- (v) Appendix C and D have been redesignated as Appendix B and C.
- (vi) Redesignated Appendix C has been amended.
- (vii) A new clause 4.1.3 has been added and the existing clauses 4.1.3, 4.1.4 and 4.1.4.1 have been renumbered as 4.1.4, 4.1.5 and 4.1.5. 1.
- (viii) Clause 12.2, line 1—Add 'In the case of Test B' at the beginning of the clause.
- (ix) A new sentence has been added at the end of clause 15.1.4.
- (i) Page 7, Fig. 6—Substitute the following for the existing caption:
'Fig. 6A Wooden Handle for Axe, Felling, Trade Pattern'.
- (ii) A new Fig. 6B has been added after 6A.
- (i) Designation of the Standard—Substitute 'IS: 807-1963' for 'IS: 807 (Part I)—1963' wherever it appears in the standard.
- (ii) Title on first cover page, and pages 1 and 3—Substitute the following for existing title:

Indian Standard

- CODE OF PRACTICE FOR
DESIGN, MANUFACTURE,
ERCTION AND TESTING (STRUCTU-
RAL PORTION) OF CRANES AND HOISTS'
- (iii) Clauses 0.1, 0.3 and 1.1 have been amended.
 - (iv) The existing clause 0.4 has been substituted by a new one.

15 Feb. 1966.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
8	IS: 956-1964 Specification for rescue tender for airfields	S.O. 2042 dated 26 June 1965.	No. 1 December, 1965.	(i) Clause 4.4.1—Substitute the following for the existing clause: ‘4.4.1 The electrical system shall be 12 volt-de throughout.’ (ii) Clause 4.2.2, line 2—Substitute ‘12-volt-de’ for ‘24-volt DC’.	
9	IS: 963-1963 Equivalent metric units for scales, dimensions and quantities in general construction work (revised).	S.O. 1373 dated 18 April 1964.	No. 2 November 1965.	Clause 8 has been amended.	
10	IS: 1051-1957 Specification for pyrethrum extracts.	S.R.O. 59 dated 4 January 1958.	No. 2 November 1965.	Clause 3.3 has been substituted by a new one.	
11	IS: 1166-1957 Specification for condensed milk.	S.O. 1598 dated 9 August 1958.	No. 2 November 1965.	Clause 5.4 has been substituted by a new one.	
12	IS: 1255-1958 Code of practice for installation and maintenance of paper-insulated power cables (up to and including 33 KV)	S.O. 74 dated 9 January 1960	No. 2 November 1965	The existing informal table in Fig. 2 has been substituted by a new one.	15 Feb 1966
13	IS: 1376-1959 Specification for cotton sewing thread, bleached or dyed, for aeronautical purposes.	S.O. 2834 dated 26 December 1959	No. 3 November 1965	Clauses 0.3 and 5.2.2. have been amended.	
14	IS: 1452-1959 Specification for rayon taffeta.	S.O. 1037 dated 30 April 1960	No. 1 November 1965	(i) Clause 0.4 and Table I have been amended. (ii) Clause 1.1 and note under clause 5.1.3 have been substituted by new ones.	
15	IS: 1518-1960 Method for gauging of petroleum and liquid petroleum products.	S.O. 1176 dated 27 May 1961	No. 2 November 1965	(i) Clauses 2.1, 10.2(c), 11.1.1, 12.1, 12.2.4, 12.5, 13.1.4, 15.1.3, 16.1.3, 16.2.2 and 17.1.6 have been amended. (ii) Clauses 6.2.1(a), 10.2(d) and 19.2.4 have been substituted by new ones.	
16	IS: 1660-1960 Specification for wrought aluminium utensils.	S.O. 2960 dated 10 December 1960	No. 2 September 1965	Table I has been amended.	

17	IS : 1337-1962 Specification for copper strip for electrical purposes with drawn or rolled edges.	S. O. 1760 dated 29 June 1963	No. 1 November 1965	First cover page, pages 1 and 2, Title-Substitute the following for the existing title : <i>'Indian Standard SPECIFICATION FOR COPPER STRIP FOR ELECTRICAL PURPOSES WITH DRAWN OR ROLLED EDGES (0.50 mm TO 150 mm WIDTH)'</i>
18	IS: 2008-1961 Method for computation of capacity tables for vertical oil storage tanks	S.O. 3226 dated 27 October 1962	No. 1 November 1965	Clause 10.1.4 has been amended.
19	IS: 2128-1962 Specification for parathion, technical.	S. O. 3593 dated 1 December 1962	No. 1 November 1965	Clauses 0.2 and 1.1 have been amended.
20	IS : 2129-1962 Specification for parathion emulsifiable concentrates.	S. O. 3881 dated 29 December 1962	No. 3 November 1965	Clauses 0.2 and 1.1 have been amended.
21	IS : 2137-1962 Specification for rayon bush shirt cloth.	S. O. 3226 dated 27 October 1962	No. 1 November 1965	(i) Clause 0.4 has been amended. (ii) Clause 1.1, note under 6.1.3 and Table I have been substituted by new ones. The existing matter against Sl. No. 14 on page 8 has been substituted by new one.
22	IS : 2200-1962 Test chart for horizontal and universal milling machines.	S. O. 1421 dated 25 May 1963	No. 1 November 1965	The existing matter against Sl. No. 12a and 12b on page 8 has been substituted by new one. Table I has been amended.
23	IS : 2201-1962 Test chart for vertical milling machines.	S. O. 1421 dated 25 May 1963	No. 1 October 1965	The existing clause 6.7.4.1 and Appendix D have been substituted by new ones.
24	IS: 2404-1963 Specification for malt extract.	S. O. 2460 dated 31 August 1963	No. 1 October 1965	(i) Clauses 2.1 and 3.3 have been amended (ii) Clause 4.2 and Table I have been substituted by new ones.
25	IS: 2592-1964 Specification for lamps for lighting on board ships.	S. O. 1840 dated 30 May 1964	No. 1 November 1965	(iii) A new Appendix A has been added after clause 5.1. (i) Clause D-3.1 has been amended. (ii) Captions of Tables 3 and 4 have been substituted by new ones.
26	IS : 2617-1964 Specification for millboard, greyboard and strawboard.	S. O. 1840 dated 30 May 1964	No. 1 November 1965	Clause 5.2 has been substituted by a new one. Clause A-3.2 has been amended.
27	IS: 2791-1964 Specification for soluble coffee powder.	S. O. 83 dated 2 January 1965	No. 2 November 1965	
28	IS: 2867-1964 Specification for canned mangoes.	S. O. 2042 dated 26 June 1965	No. 1 November 1965	
29	IS: 2870-1964 Specification for charge pump for pressure-retaining knapsack sprayer.	S. O. 618 dated 20 February 1965	No. 1 November 1965	

15 Feb. 1966

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
30	IS: 2925-1964 Specification for industrial safety helmets.	S. O. 1152 dated 10 April 1965	No. 1 November 1965	Clause 6.4.1—Add the following at the end of the sentence: ‘unless some other types of helmets are approved by the appropriate authority’. Clause 4.4.1 has been amended.	
31	IS: 2930-1964 Specification for hose laying tender for fire brigade use.	S. O. 1152 dated 10 April 1965	No. 1 December 1965		
32	IS: 3005-1964 Specification for grey cast iron ingot moulds, stools and slag ladles.	S. O. 3322 dated 23 October 1965	No. 1 November 1965	Clause 7.2, line 2—Substitute ‘25mm’ for ‘12 mm’.	15 Feb. 1966
33	IS: 3041-1965 Specification for chewing tobacco, manufactured minced type.	S. O. 2134 dated 3 July 1965	No. 1 December 1965	Table 3 has been amended.	
34	IS: 3102-1965 Classification of bricks.	S. O. 3450 dated 6 November 1965	No. 1 December 1965	First cover page, pages 1 and 3, Title-Substitute the following for the existing title : <i>‘Indian Standard CLASSIFICATION OF BURNT CLAY BRICKS’</i>	
35	IS: 3168-1965 Specification for brass strip and foil for deep drawing.	S. O. 3450 dated 6 November 1965	No. 1 November 1965	Clauses 12.2.2, 12.2.2.2 and 12.2.3 have been amended.	

Copies of these amendment slips are available, free of cost, with the Indian Standards Institution, Manek Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-1 and also its branch offices at (i) Bombay Mutual Terrance, First Floor, 534 Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel Road, Bombay-7, (ii) Third and Fourth Floors, 5 Chowringhee Approach, Calcutta-13, (iii) Second Floor, Sathyamurthi Bhavan, 54 General Patters Road, Madras-2 and (iv) 14/69 Civil Lines, Kanpur.

[No. MD/13 :5.I
D. DAS GUPTA,
Deputy Director.

(Department of Industry & Supply)

(Indian Standards Institution)

New Delhi, 8th February 1966

S.O. 525.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (1) of regulation 8 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, as amended in 1961, 1962 and 1964, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that sixteen licences, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been granted authorizing the licenses to use the Standard Mark.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. and Date	Period of Validity		Name and Address of the Licensee	Article/Process Covered by the Licence	Relevant Indian Standard
		From	To			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1	CM/L-1189 6-1-1966	16-1-66	15-1-67	M/s Nestle's Products (India) Ltd., 3, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi (Factory at Ludhiana-Ferozepur Link Road, Near Kingwah Canal, Moga, Punjab, under the style of Food Specialties Ltd.)	Infant milkfoods 'LACTOGEN' brand	IS : 1547-1960 Specification for infant milk foods
2	CM/L-1190 6-1-1966	16-1-66	15-1-67	M/s Central Insecticides & Fertilizers, 1110, Industrial Estate, Indore (M.P.)	BHC water dispersible powder concentrates	IS : 562-1962 Specification for BHC water dispersible powder concentrates (second revision).
3	CM/L-1191 6-1-1966	16-1-66	15-1-67	M/s Central Insecticides & Fertilizers, 1110, Industrial Estate, Indore (M.P.)	BHC dusting powders	IS : 561-1962 Specification for BHC dusting powders (second revision)
4	CM/L-1192 7-1-66	16-1-66	15-1-67	The Cawnpore Oil & Soap Mills Pvt. Ltd., 84/6, Factory Area, Kanpur.	Mutton tallow, grade 1 and grade 2, 'COSM' brand	IS : 887-1960 Specification for mutton tallow
5	CM/L-1193 10-1-1966	16-1-66	15-1-67	The Bharat Carbon & Ribbon Mfg. Co. Ltd., 543, Basantlal Saha Road, Calcutta-53 having their office at N-75, Bombay Life Building, Connaught Circus, New Delhi-1.	Ink, duplicating, all weather, black for rotary type machines, PAVAN' brand	IS : 1222-1957 Specification for ink duplicating, all weather, black for rotary type machines

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
6	CM/L-1194 10-1-1966	16-1-66	15-1-67	The Bengal Machinery Co. Pvt. Ltd., 9-A, New Tangra Road, Calcutta-46.	Cast iron flushing cisterns for Water closets and Urinals. (Bell Type) High Level 15 Litre Capacity 'BMC' brand	IS : 774-1964 Specification for flushing cisterns for water closets and urinals (valveless siphonic type) (second revision)
7	CM/L-1195 10-1-66	16-1-66	15-1-67	M/s Prakash Metal Industries, Chhachrauli Gate, Jagadri (Punjab).	Rolled brass sheet and strip Grade Bs 63, 'PARKASH' brand	IS : 410-1959 Specification for rolled brass plate, sheet, strip and foil (revised)
8	CM/L-1196 10-1-1966	16-1-66	15-1-67	M/s E.I.D. Parry Ltd., Ranipet (North Arcot Distt) having their office at Dare House, Madras-1.	Vitreous sanitary appliances (Vitreous china consisting of— (1) Wash-down water-closets, pattern I, height 400 mm front and rear (with P-trap and S-trap) (2) Squatting pans and traps long pan patterns, size 350 mm and 550 mm (with corresponding trap) (3) Wash-basins, flat back, size 550 x 400 mm (4) Sinks laboratory, size 450 x 300 x 150 mm (5) Urinals, bowl, F. back, size 430 x 260 x 350 mm 'Parryware' brand	IS : 2556-1963 Specification for vitreous sanitary appliances (vitreous china)
9	CM/L-1197 14-1-1966	16-1-66	15-1-67	M/s Dharti Dhan Pvt. Ltd., Sunder vas, Station Road, Udaipur.	BHC dusting powders 'DD' brand	IS : 561-1962 Specification for BHC dusting powders (second revision)
10	CM/L-1198 18-1-1966	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s Bengal Enamel Works Ltd., Enamelnagar, Palta, 24 Parganas having their Registered Office at 41, Chowringhee Road, Calcutta-16.	Enamelware for home use 'TIGER' brand	IS : 3149-1965 Specification for enamelware for home use
11	CM/L-1199 18-1-1966	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s Bharat Pulverising Mills Pvt. Ltd., Chinchpokli Cross Lane, Byculla, Bombay-27 having their office at Hexamar House, 28-A, Sayani Road, Bombay-28.	Graphite powder for use as foundry facing material, grade 1	IS : 1305-1963 Specification for graphite for use as foundry facing material (revised)

12 CM/L-1200 . 19-1-66	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Hindusthan National Glass Mfg. Co. Ltd., Bahadurgarh, Distt. Rohtak (Punjab)	Glass milk bottles, 500 ml. only	IS : 1392-1959 Specification for glass milk bottles
13 CM/L-1201 . 20-1-1966	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Central Insecticides & Fertilizers, Saki Naka, Vihar Lake Road, Kurla, Bombay-70, having their office at 110, Industrial Estate, Indore, Madhya Pradesh.	BHC dusting powders	IS : 561-1962 Specification for BHC dusting powders (second revision).
14 CM/L-1202 . 20-1-1966	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Central Insecticides & Fertilizers, Saki Naka, Vihar Lake Road, Kurla, Bombay-70, having their office at 110, Industrial Estate, Indore, Madhya Pradesh.	Endrin emulsifiable concentrates	IS : 1310-1958 Specification for endrin emulsifiable concentrates.
15 CM/L-1203 . 20-1-1966	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Kaira District Co-operative Milk Producers' Union Ltd., Anand (W. Rly), Kaira District, Gujarat State.	Condensed milk, full-cream, sweetened, 'Amul' brand	IS : 1166-1957 Specification for condensed milk.
16 CM/L-1204 . 21-1-1966	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Indian Wire Products Pvt. Ltd., Premier Nagar, Aligarh (U.P.)	Vulcanized rubber-insulated cables for fixed wiring with aluminium conductors, 250/440 volts grade only, 'TIGER' brand of the following type :	IS : 434 (Part II)-1964 Specification for rubber-insulated cables with aluminum conductors (revised).
				(i) Braided and compounded ; (ii) Tough rubber sheathed; and (iii) Weatherproof (house service overhead system cables)	

[No. MD/33: 16]

S.O.526.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (1) of regulation 8 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, as amended in 1961, 1962 and 1964, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that sixtyfive licences particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been renewed.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. and Date	Period of Validity		Name and Address of the Licensee	Article(s) Covered by the Licence	Relevant Indian Standard(s)
		From	To			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1	CM/L-45 20-1-1958	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. B.S. & Company, 33, Bourne Road, Calcutta-1. (Plywood Mill No. I).	Bra- Tea-chest plywood panels	IS : 10-1953 Specification for plywood tea-chests (revised).
2	CM/L-47 20-1-1958	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Hunsur Plywood Works, P. O. Hunsur, Mysore State.	Tea-chest plywood panels	IS : 10-1953 Specification for ply- wood tea-chests (revised).
3	CM/L-50 20-1-1958	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. East India Plywood Co. Pri- vate Ltd., 76, Jessore Road, Dum Dum, Calcutta-28.	Tea-chest plywood panels	IS : 10-1953 Specification for ply- wood tea-chests (revised).
4	CM/L-51 28-1-1958	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Jeypore Timber & Veneer Mills Pvt. Ltd., Dibrugarh, Distt. Lakhimpur, Upper Assam.	Tea-chest plywood panels	IS : 10-1953 Specification for ply- wood tea-chests (revised).
5	CM/L-52 28-1-1958	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Malabar Plywood Works, Che- ruvannur, Feroke, Kerala State.	Tea-chest plywood panels	IS : 10-1953 Specification for ply- wood tea-chests (revised).
6	CM/L-53 28-1-1958	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. South India Plywood Indus- tries, Market Landing, Kotta- yam (Kerala State).	Tea-chest plywood panels	IS : 10-1953 Specification for ply- wood tea-chests (revised).
7	CM/L-56 28-1-1958	1-2-66	31-1-67	The Great Indian Plywood Co., 76, Jessore Road, Dum, Calcutta-28.	Mfg. Tea-chest plywood panels	IS : 10-1953 Specification for ply- wood tea-chests (revised).
8	CM/L-57 28-1-1958	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Assam Valley Plywood Ltd., 67-B, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1.	Pvt. Tea-chest plywood panels	IS : 10-1953 Specification for ply- wood tea-chests (revised).
9	CM/L-58 28-1-1958	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Assam Bengal Veneer Indus- tries Private Ltd., 9, Clive Row, Calcutta-1 (Factory at Calcutta).	Tea-chest plywood panels	IS : 10-1953 Specification for ply- wood tea-chests (revised).

10	CM/L-59 23-1-1958	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Assam Bengal Veneer Industries Private Ltd., 9, Clive Row, Calcutta-1 (Factory at Oodla-bari).	Tea-chest plywood panels	IS : 10-1953 Specification for plywood tea-chests (revised).
11	CM/L-60 28-1-1958	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Standard Furniture Co. Ltd., Kallai, Kozhikode-3, Kerala State.	Tea-chest plywood panels	IS : 10-1953 Specification for plywood tea-chests (revised).
12	CM/L-113 19-1-1959	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Phoenix Plywood, Kottayam, (Kerala State).	Tea-chest plywood panels	IS : 10-1953 Specification for plywood tea-chests (revised).
13	CM/L-114 19-1-1959	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Veneers Plywood Co., Nemmara P.O., Kerala State.	Tea-chest plywood panels	IS : 10-1953 Specification for plywood tea-chests (revised).
14	CM/L-146 28-9-1959	1-1-66	31-12-66	M/s. Bharat Pulverising Mills Pvt. Ltd., 38-A, Sayani Road, Bombay-28.	BHC water dispersible powder concentrates	IS: 562-1962 Specification for BHC water dispersible powder concentrates (second revision).
15	CM/L-156 20-11-1959	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Sulekha Works Ltd., Sulekha Park, Jadavpur, Calcutta-32.	Ferro-gallo tannate fountain pen ink (0.1 percent iron content)	IS : 220-1959 Specification for ferro-gallo tannate fountain pen ink (0.1 percent iron content) (revised).
16	CM/L-158 15-1-1960	1-2-66	31-1-67	The Aluminium Industries Ltd., Hirakud, Sambalpur Distt. (Orissa State).	Steel-cored and plain standard aluminium conductors of all types and sizes specified in IS : 398-1961	IS : 398-1961 Specification for hard-drawn stranded aluminium and steel-cored aluminium conductors for overhead power transmission purposes (revised).
17	CM/L-161 15-1-1960	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Patiala Biscuit Manufacturers Private Ltd., Rajpura (Punjab).	Biscuits (excluding water biscuits)	IS : 1011-1957 Specification for biscuits (excluding water biscuits).
18	CM/L-215 29-8-1960	16-1-66	15-1-67	M/s Tata Fison Industries Ltd., Pandit Motilal Nehru Road, Jamuna Kinara, Agra (U.P.).	BHC dusting powders	IS : 561-1962 Specification for BHC dusting powders (second revision).
19	CM/L-226 16-9-1960	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Sulekha Works Ltd., Sulekha Park, Jadavpur, Calcutta-32.	Dye-based fountain pen inks, blue, green and red	IS : 1221-1957 Specification for dye-based fountain pen inks (blue, green, violet, black and red).
20	CM/L-233 18-10-1960	16-1-66	15-1-67	M/s. Great Eastern Cutlery Works, 20-Strand Road, Calcutta-1.	Pruning knives, hooked and curved	IS: 619-1961 Specification for pruning knives, hooked and curved (revised).

(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
21 CM/L-256 29-12-1960	16-1-66	15-1-67	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Ltd., Palluruthy, Cochin.	Copper oxychloride dusting powders.	IS : 1506-1959 Specification for copper oxychloride dusting powders.
22 CM/L-257 29-12-1960	16-1-66	15-1-67	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Ltd., Palluruthy, Cochin-5.	Copper oxychloride water dispersible powder concentrates.	IS : 1507-1959 Specification for copper oxychloride water dispersible powder concentrates.
23 CM/L-259 13-1-1961	16-1-66	15-1-67	M/s. G. M. C. Himco Industries Limited, Kamla Nagar, Subzimandi, Delhi-6.	18-litre square tins.	IS : 916-1959 Specification for 18-litre square tins.
24 CM/L-269 30-1-1961	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Flintrock Products Private Ltd., Belvedere Road, Mazagaon, Bombay-10.	DDT water dispersible powder concentrates.	IS : 565-1961 Specification for DDT water dispersible powder concentrates (revised).
25 CM/L-338 1-9-1961	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Indo Asian Traders Private Ltd., Nakodar Road, Jullundur City.	Metal clad switches, 15 Amp. 250 volts, with HC type fuse base and carrier.	IS : 1567-1960 Specification for metal clad switches (current rating not exceeding 100 Amperes).
26 CM/L-372 11-1-1962	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Ltd., Pandit Motilal Nehru Road, Jumna Kishara, Agra (U.P.).	BHC emulsifiable concentrates.	IS : 632-1958 Specification for BHC emulsifiable concentrates (revised).
27 CM/L-374 11-1-1962	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Abrol Engineering Company, Circular Road, Kapurthala.	Metal clad switches, 15 Amp. 250 volts, with HC and MEM types fuse bases and carriers.	IS : 1567-1960 Specification for metal clad switches (current rating not exceeding 100 Amperes).
28 CM/L-376 16-1-1962	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Surma Valley Saw Mills Private Ltd., P.O. Bhangabazar, Distt. Cochbar, Assam.	Tea-chest plywood panels.	IS : 10-1953 Specification for plywood tea-chests (revised).
29 CM/L-480 29-11-1962	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Jai Electrical Industries, S/52, Industrial Area, Jullundur City.	Metal clad switches, 15 Amp. 250 volts, with HC type fuse base and carrier.	IS : 1567-1960 Specification for metal clad switches (current rating not exceeding 100 amperes).
30 CM/L-481 29-11-1962	16-1-66	15-1-67	Government Central Lock Factory, (Directorate of Industries, Govt. of West Bengal), Baragachia Distt. Howrah.	Brass padlocks M. type brass pad-locks.	IS : 275-1961 Specification for padlocks (second revision) IS : 1018-1961 Specification for M type brass padlocks (revised).

31	CM/L-486 26-12-1962	17-1-66	31-12-66	M/s. Glenfield Kennedy Limited 4, Fairlie Place, Fairlie House, Calcutta-1	Sluice valves for water works purposes, Brand name 'Glenfield-burn'	IS : 780-1963 Specification for sluice valves up to 300 mm size for water works purposes (inside screw non-rising spindle type) (revised)
32	CM/L-487 26-12-1962	16-1-66	15-1-67	M/s. Sulekha Works Ltd., Sulekha Park, Jadavpur, Calcutta-32.	Ink, drawing, waterproof, black	IS : 789-1955 Specification for ink, drawing, water proof, black
33	CM/L-489 26-12-1962	16-1-66	15-1-67	M/s. Bhangar Bros. & Co. Private Ltd. 142/48, Ghodbunder Road, Jogeshwari, Bombay-60 having their Regd. office at Anand House, 158 Kalbadevi Road, Bombay-2.	Three-phase induction motors up to 5 HP only	IS : 325-1962 Specification for three-phase induction motors (second revision)
34	CM/L-490 26-12-1962	16-1-66	15-1-67	M/s. Bhangar Bros. & Co. Private Ltd., 142/48, Ghodbunder Road, Jogeshwari, Bombay-60 having their Regd. office at Anand House, 158 Kalbadevi Road, Bombay-2	Fractional horse power electric motors	IS: 996-1959 Specification for small AC and universal motors with class 'A' insulation
35	CM/L-494 31-12-1962	16-1-66	15-1-67	M/s. C. M.C. (India), Survey No. 529, near Electricity Sub-Station, Odhav Road, Ahmedabad-10	Ultramarine blue for paints	IS: 55-1950 Specification for ultramarine blue for paints
36	CM/L-495 31-12-1962	16-1-66	15-1-67	M/s. Feroke Tile Works, Feroke (Kerala State)	Salt-glazed stoneware pipes and fittings of diameter 100 mm, 150 mm and 300 mm	IS: 651-1962 Specification for salt-glazed stoneware pipes and fittings (revised)
37	CM/L-499 14-1-1963	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Kolay Biscuits Co. (Private) Ltd. 100-A, Charakdanga Road, Beliaghata Road, Calcutta-10	Biscuits (excluding wafer biscuits)	IS : 1011-1957 Specification for biscuits (excluding wafer biscuits)"
38	CM/L-500 14-1-1963	1-2-66	31-1-67	The Aluminium Industries Ltd., No. 1, Ceramic Factory Road, Kundara (Kerala State)	PVC cables only with aluminium conductors (250/440 and 650/100 volts grade)	(i) IS : 694 (Part I)-1964 Specification for PVC insulated cables (for working voltages up to 1100 V) with copper conductors (revised) (ii) IS : 694 (Part II)-1964 Specification for PVC insulated cables (for working voltages up to 1100 V) with aluminium conductors (revised)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
39	CM/L-501 23-1-1963	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Ltd., 20 Howrah Road, Salkia, Cal- cutta having their Head Office at Union Bank Building, Dalal Street, Fort, Bombay-I	Endrin emulsifiable concentrates	IS : 1310-1958 Specification for endrin emulsifiable concentrates
40	CM/L-574 29-8-1963.	1-9-65	31-8-66	M/s. Padma Ltd. P.O. Olivion- cherra, Distt. Cachar, Assam.	Tea-chest plywood panels.	IS : 10-1953 Specification for ply- wood tea-chests (revised)
41	CM/L-610 31-12-1963	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Asain Cables Corporation Ltd., Kotak Wadi, Pokhran Road, Post Box No. 11, Thana (Maharashtra State) having their Regd. Office at Navsari Building, 240 D. Naoroji Road, Fort, Bombay-I	(i) PVC insulated cables, unshe- athed, both with aluminium and copper conductors, 250/440 and 650/1 100 volts grade ; (ii) PVC insulated and PVC sheathed cables with aluminium and copper conductors, 250/440 volts grade ; (iii) PVC insulated and PVC sheathed cables with aluminium conductors, 650/1 100 volts grade ; and (iv) PVC insulated flexible cords with copper conductors only, 250/440 volts grade	(i) IS : 694 (Part I)-1964 Speci- fication for PVC insulated cables (for working voltages up to 1 100 V) with copper conductor (revised) (ii) IS : 694 (Part II)-1964 Speci- fication for PVC insulated cables (for working voltages upto 1 100 V) with Aluminium conductors (revised)
42	CM/L-611 31-12-1963	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. Parkash Puverising Mills, Industrial Area, Alwar	BHC dusting powders	IS : 561-1962 Specification for BHC dusting powders (second (revision)
43	CM/L-612 31-12-1963.	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s. National Refinery Pvt. Ltd., 205/207 Swami Vivekanand Road, Jogeshwari, Bombay-60 having their office at 87-Tardeo Road, Bombay-34	Silver solder	IS : 192-1956 Specification for silver solder (revised.)
44	CM/L-613 31-12-1963	1-2-66	31-1-67	The National Rolling and Steel Ropes Ltd., Shambnagar, 24 Parganas, West Bengal having their Regd. office at Nicco House 1 & 2 Hare Street, Cal- cutta-I	Steel wire ropes for haulage pur- poses in mines	IS : 1856-1961 Specification for steel wire ropes for haulage pu- poses in mines.

45	CM/L-614 31-12-1963	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s Llyod Bitumen Products, 1 Taratola Road, Calcutta having their office at 4A, Royd Street, Calcutta-16	Preformed fillers for expansion joint in concrete non-extruding and resilient type (bitumen-impregnated fibre)	IS: 1838—1961 Specification for preformed fillers for expansion joint in concrete non-extruding and resilient type (bitumen-impregnated fibre).
46	CM/L-615 31-12-1963	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s Bayer (India) Ltd., Polkhawadi, Off Cadell Road, Bombay-28 having their office at Nagin Mahal, 6th Floor, 82, Veer Nariman Road, Fort, Bombay-1	Parathion emulsifiable concentrates	IS: 2129—1962 Specification for parathion emulsifiable concentrates
47	CM/L-616 7-1-1964	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s Jaipur Metals and Electricals Limited, Near Railway Station Jaipur (Rajasthan)	Hard-drawn stranded aluminium and steel-cored aluminium conductors for overhead power transmission purposes	IS: 398—1961 Specification for hard-drawn stranded aluminium and steel-cored aluminium conductors for overhead power transmission purposes (revised)
48	CM/L-793 30-9-1964	1-10-65	30-9-66	M/s National Steel Works Ltd., Warden House (First Floor), Sir Firozeshah Mehta Road, Fort, Bombay	Structural steel (standard quality)	IS: 226—1962 Specification for structural steel (standard quality) (third revision)
49	CM/L-794 30-9-1964	1-10-65	30-9-66	M/s. National Steel Works Ltd., Warden House (First Floor), Sir Firozeshah Mehta Road, Fort, Bombay	Structural steel (ordinary quality)	IS: 1977—1962 Specification for structural steel (ordinary quality)
50	CM/L-829 2-II-1964	16-II-65	15-II-66	M/s. National Industrial Corporation, Warden House (First Floor), Sir Firozeshah Mehta Road, Fort, Bombay	Structural steel (standard quality)	IS: 226—1962 Specification for structural steel (standard quality) (third revision)
51	CM/L-830 2-II-1964	16-II-65	15-II-66	M/s National Industrial Corporation, Warden House (First Floor), Sir Firozeshah Mehta Road, Fort, Bombay	Structural steel (ordinary quality)	IS: 1977—1960 Specification for structural steel (ordinary quality)
52]	CM/L-982 24-12-1964	16-I-66	15-I-67	M/s Kamani Metallic Oxides Private Ltd., Agra Road, Kurla, Bombay-70 (AS)	Litharge for paints	IS: 58—1950 Specification for litharge for paints
53	CM/L-983 24-12-1964	16-I-66	15-I-67	M/s Kamani Metallic Oxides Private Ltd., Agra Road, Kurla, Bombay-70 (AS)	Zinc oxides for paints	IS: 35—1950 Specification for zinc oxides for paints

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
54	CM/L-984 24-12-1964	16-1-66	15-1-67	M/s Kamani Metallic Oxides Private Ltd., Agra Road, Kurla, Bombay-70 (AS)	Red lead for paints, type C	IS: 57—1950 Specification for red lead for paints
55	CM/L-986 29-12-1964	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s Santosh Industries, 87/6 Kalpi Road, Meeraganj, Kannpur	Fractional horse power electric motors, universal type, 1/20 hp only	IS: 996—1959 Specification for small AC and universal electric motors with class 'A' insulation.
56	CM/L-987 29-12-1964	1-2-66	31-1-67	The Raja Bahadur Motilal Poona Mills Ltd., 5 Raja Bahadur Motilal Road, Poona-1	(i) Drafting machines; (ii) Stands for use with drafting machines; and (iii) Drafting units along with protractors head and scales for use with drafting machines	IS: 2287—1963 Specification for drafting machines
57	CM/L-988 31-12-1964	16-1-66	15-1-67	M/s Emco General Industries, 95/1 Cossipore Road, Calcutta-12 (West Bengal) having their office at P-16 New C.I.T. Road, India Exchange Place Extension, Calcutta-12	Plastic water-closet seats and covers phenolic Brand name "EMCOS"	IS: 2548—1963 Specification for plastic water-closet seats and covers
58	CM/L-989 31-12-1964	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s Special Steels Limited, Datapara Road, Borivli (East), Bombay-66	Plain hard-drawn steel wire for prestressed concrete	IS: 1785—1961 Specification for plain hard-drawn steel wire for prestressed concrete
59	CM/L-991 21-1-1965	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s Assam Forest Products Pvt. Ltd., Makum Junction (Assam) having their Regd. Office at Dibrugarh, Distt. Lakhimpur, Assam	Plywood for general purposes	IS: 303—1960 Specification for plywood for general purposes (revised)
60	CM/L-993 25-1-1965	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s Indiclay, Plot No. 2, Udyog Nagar, Goregaon, Bombay-62	BHC dusting powders	IS: 561—1962 Specification for BHC dusting powders (second revision)
61	CM/L-994 25-1-1965	1-2-66	31-1-67	M/s All India Medical Corporation, Simpoli Road, Borivli West, Bombay-66 having their office at 185 Princess Street, Bombay-2	DDT dusting powders	IS: 564—1961 Specification for DDT dusting powders (revised)

62	CM/L—995 25-I-1965	I-2-66	31-I-67	M/s All India Medical Corporation, Simpoli Road, Borivli West, Bombay-66 having their office at 185 Princess Street, Bombay-2.	Endrin emulsifiable concentrates	IS: 1310—1958 Specification for endrin emulsifiable concentrates
63	CM/L—996 25-I-1965	I-2-66	31-I-67	M/s All India Medical Corporation Simpoli, Road Borivli West, Bombay-66 having their office at 185 Princess Street, Bombay-2.	Copper oxychloride water dispersible powder concentrates	IS: 1507—1959 Specification for copper oxychloride water dispersible powder concentrates
64	CM/L—997 25-I-1965	I-2-66	31-I-67	The Omega Insulated Cable Co. (India) Limited, Plot Nos. 16 & 17, Industrial Estate, Ambattur, Madras-53 having their office at 122/2 Mount Road, Madras-6.	Type Voltage Conductor Grade <i>PVC insulated cables</i> (i) Single core 250/440 aluminium (unsheathed) volts un only (ii) Single core 650/1100 copper (unsheathed) volts or aluminium (iii) Single core 250/440 (PVC sheathed) volts copper or aluminium	(i) IS: 694 (Part I)—1964 Specification for PVC insulated cables (for working voltages up to 1100 V) with copper conductors (revised) (ii) IS: 694 (Part II)—1964 Specification for PVC insulated cables (for working voltages up to 1100 V) with aluminium conductors (revised)
65	CM/L—999 29-I-1965	I-2-66	31-I-67	M/s Rajasthan Industrial & Scientific Corporation, 39 Industrial Area, Jhotwara, (Jaipur West), Jaipur having their office at Rahul Meters, Chaura Rasta, Jaipur.	Water meters (domestic type) 15 mm size	IS: 779—1965 Specification for water meters (domestic type) (second revision)

No. MD/33 : 16-A.]
D. V. KARMARKAR,
Joint Director (Marks).

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM & CHEMICALS

New Delhi, the 9th February 1966

S.O. 527.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum between Barauni Refinery in Bihar State and Haldia Port in Calcutta in West Bengal State, pipelines should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited and that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the Schedule annexed hereto.

2. Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein.

3. Any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the competent authority, 9, Syed Amir Ali Avenue, Calcutta-17 in the office of the Indian Oil Corporation Limited. Every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

State—West Bengal	Distt.—Howrah.	Thana—Bagrian
Village	Survey No.	Extent (Area)
Matinala J. L. 24.	191	.46
Ashraria J. L. 21.	51 52	.03 .02

[No. 31(33)/63-ONG-Vol.28.]

S.O. 528.—Whereas by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum & Chemicals S.O. No. 2547 dated 14th August 1965 under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Govt. declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipelines;

And, whereas, the Competent Authority has, under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And, whereas, the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification is hereby acquired for laying the pipelines and in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (4) of that Section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands, shall instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest on the date of publication of this declaration in the free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

State—West Bengal

Distt.—Howrah

Thana—Bagrijan

Village	Survey Nos. (Plot Nos.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey Nos. (Plot Nos.)	Extent (Area)		
Mellak, J. L. 20.							
	1424	.06		Asharia, J. L. 21—(contd.)			
	1425	.05		49	.07		
	1426	.16		134	.005		
	1427	.08		135	.07		
	1428	.02		136	.10		
	1456	.06		137	.16		
	1970	.12		138	.18		
	1971	.35		390	.11		
	1972	.03	Chakkamala, J.L. 23				
	1973	.08		1	.10		
	1974	.09		5	.04		
	1975	.08		6	.03		
	1976	.10		8	.005		
	1977	.05		987	.01		
	1978	.02	Matinala, J.L. 24.				
	1981	.005		183	.20		
	1982	.08		184	.04		
	2144	.05		207	.005		
	2145	.10		213	.14		
	2147	.18		214	.27		
	2148	.18		236	.03		
	2165	.01		286	.03		
	2167	.07		287	.04		
	2168	.06		288	.10		
	2169	.05		292	.08		
	2170	.13		293	.01		
	2188	.13		298	.04		
	2189	.04		299	.03		
	2195	.32		300	.02		
	2196	.14		301	.005		
	2197	.08		314	.24		
	2202	.02		315	.15		
	2207	.01		316	.08		
	2208	.02		317	.01		
	2209	.04		353	.04		
	2210	.005		354	.19		
	2211	.03		355	.12		
	2212	.05		356	.16		
	2213	.05		371	.03		
	2214	.11		373	.30		
	2230	.39		381	.005		
	2231	.25		382	.03		
	2235	.01		383	.04		
	2303	.005		384	.07		
Vill. Asharia, J.L.21.							
	16	.26		385	.06		
	17	.16		386	.03		
	18	.03		387	.16		
	19	.01		388	.01		
	20	.005		394	.12		
	21	.06		408	.05		
	22	.11		420	.10		
	23	.04		421	.18		
	35	.005		434	.01		
	36	.13		435	.18		
	37	.20		436	.17		
	38	.11		442	.10		
	41	.18		443	.04		
	42	.06		503	.06		

Village	Survey Nos. (Plots Nos.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey Nos. (Plot Nos.)	Extent (Area)
Naopala, J.L. 25.	383 417 418 419 420 421 422 424 425 426 434 435 436 521 525 526 528 529 530	.07 .09 .07 .03 .09 .20 .05 .02 .01 .005 .06 .04 .03 .01 .03 .31 .10 .11 .02	Barunda J. L. 32.—contd.	104 111 115 116 122 125 127 130 131 138 152 153 157 158 159 160 161	.04 .18 .10 .03 .18 .005 .14 .22 .02 .50 .15 .40 .25 .005 .30 .09 .06
Iswaripur J. L. 34.	608 609 610 616 617 619 713 723 725 726 727 728 729 730 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 800 803 941 976 1000 1019 1020 1021 1022 1023 1659 1660 1661 1666 1778 2008 2008A 2009 2012 2013	.005 .26 .02 .16 .005 .03 .01 .03 .18 .10 .08 .09 .18 .02 .26 .03 .09 .14 .27 .03 .03 .06 .03 .01 .09 .14 .27 .03 .03 .06 .03 .10 .06 .05 .06 .29 .16 .25 .01 3.78 .18 .10 .14 .46	I 4 5 8 9 10 11 12 13 30 392	I 4 5 8 9 10 11 12 13 30 392	.02 .03 .02 .10 .06 .06 .40 .06 .15 .01 .08
Barunda, J. L. 32.	93 95 96 102 103	.03 .02 .18 .22 .38	Brahman Dukuria, J. L. 35.	153 154 156 275 276 277 279 280 281 282 283 285 287 307 311 312 313 314 315 317 319 320 321 367 369 370 371 373 374 375 376 377 496	.04 .10 .02 .11 .01 .01 .09 .03 .04 .08 .07 .01 .14 .20 .02 .18 .05 .16 .05 .10 .16 .03 .11 .15 .01 .01 .16 .19 .08 .01 .12

Village	Survey Nos. (Plot nos.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey Nos. (Plot nos.)	Extent (Area)
Brahman Dukuria J.L. 35 —contd	497 499 500 504 505 506 507 508 509 539 560 564 572 574 575 576 577 652 668 669 670 673 797 818 822 839	.19 .03 .36 .03 .06 .12 .09 .01 .03 .14 .26 .005 .09 .06 .04 .09 .10 .03 .14 .12 .13 .01 .01 .005 .07 .005	Murgaberia J.L. 55 contd.	1583 1584 1585 1586 1587 1588 1592 1593 1594 1595 1596 1597 1598 1649	.08 .05 .005 .16 .01 .02 .22 .06 .005 .03 .10 .08 .01 .55
Gopalpur, J. L. 41.	281 482 484 485 486 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 620	.15 .005 .14 .07 .02 .03 .02 .19 .07 .03 .09 .04 .05 .09 .18 .22 .10 .04 .02	Chandrapur, J. L. 58	60 61 62 64 65 66 68 72 76 77 78 79 80 81 84 85 86 87 88 91 93 99 100 102 103 104 105 106 108 190 191 195 197	.05 .09 .08 .18 .08 .07 .17 .18 .14 .01 .20 .19 .02 .23 .32 .48 .12 .20 .19 .02 .01 .01 .45 .06 .27 .10 .52 .02
Murgaberia, J. L. 55.	1467 1468 1469 1528 1537 1539 1540 1559 1560 1561 1562 1565 1566 1567 1568 1574 1582	.005 .18 .005 .14 .02 .20 .02 .01 .06 .12 .005 .005 .12 .16 .32 .01 .08	Vill. Khadinan, J. L. 59.	1154 1155 1189 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275	.08 .06 .02 .01 .23 .02 .02 .15 .30 .18 .33 .005 .08

Village	Survey Nos. (Plot Nos.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey Nos. (Plot Nos.)	Extent (Area)
Khadinan, J. L. 59.— <i>Contd.</i>	300	.03	Bagnan, J. L. 60.	49	.02
	301	.03		51	.16
	302	.27		52	.08
	305	.005		53	.16
	306	.005		54	.09
	307	.03		55	.06
	315	.40		56	.04
	316	.06		62	.02
	317	.005		63	.18
	319	.02		64	.38
	322	.14		65	.04
	328	.10		70	.01
	374	.005		73	.38
	386	.06		74	.10
	387	.18		164	.10
	388	.01		165	.37
	389	.14		166	.01
	394	.03		167	.10
	541	.02		176	.01
	714	.03		622	.03
	715	.08		623	.005
	727	.05		624	.005
	728	.11		636	.37
	729	.20		665	.09
	730	.12		667	.005
	745	.32		1370	.06
	746	.11		1371	.04
	747	.06		1441	.10
	748	.05			
	751	.20	Vill. Hilkak, J. L. 61.	4	.08
	752	.07		45	.10
	753	.01		46	.04
	754	.38		47	.05
	780	.02		48	.06
	809	.32		49	.10
	810	.54		53	.33
	812	.12		78	.52
	813	.04		79	.03
	969	.10		80	.13
	970	.12		94	.10
	971	.03		95	.13
	986	.01		98	.05
	987	.03		99	.01
	988	.07		100	.30
	989	.08		101	.01
	990	.07		264	.10
	991	.03		265	.10
	992	.16		268	.10
	1000	.02		269	.11
	1001	.005		270	.15
	1003	.20		274	.03
	1004	.02		275	.14
	1012	.32		276	.14
	1013	.005		277	.10
	1020	.03		325	.08
	1021	.05		326	.07
	1022	.05		327	.20
	1023	.02		329	.15
	1111	.10		330	.12
	1137	.005		341	.06
	1138	.05		344	.04
	1139	.05		345	.02
	1153	.005		570	.04
	1234	.03		587	.42
	1592	.10		588	.01
	1636	.02		593	.23

Village	Survey Nos. (Plot Nos.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey Nos. (Plot Nos.)	Extent (Area)
Hijlak, J. L. 61—Contd.	596	.02	Hijlak, J. I. 61—Contd.	1326	.06
	597	.04		1330	.13
	598	.08		1331	.16
	599	.02		1349	.21
	600	.09		1350	.08
	601	.18		1352	.18
	602	.21		1353	.10
	603	.02		1354	.09
	866	.04		1355	.03
	1323	.05		1361	.02
	1324	.01		1496	.03
	1325	.07			

[No. F. 31(33)/63-ONG/OR/Vol.28.]

ERRATUM

S.O. 529.—In Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals, S.O. No. 2547, dated 14th August 1965, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3 in Sub-Section (ii)—

at page 2 of schedule, village Natinula, J.L. 24, P.S. Bagnan, Distt. Howrah for "Survey No. 191 extent area .27" read "Survey No. 191 extent area .46"

at page 1 of schedule, village Ashria, J.L. 21, P. S Bagnan, Distt. Howrah for "Survey Nos. 1 & 2 extent of areas .02 and .02" respectively read "Survey No. 51 extent of area .03 and Survey No. 52 extent of area .02"

delete "Survey Nos. 186, 187, 188 & 190" in village Matinala, J.L. 24, and Survey No. 276 extent area .38 in village Khadinan, J.L. 59, Thana Bagnan, Dist. Howrah.

[No. 31(33)/63-ONG/OR-VOL.28.]

V. P. AGARWAL, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF WORKS, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

New Delhi, the 11th February 1966

S.O. 530.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1958 (No 32 of 1958), and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Works and Housing No. 32(11)/64-Acc II, dated the 4th January, 1965, the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in column 1 of the table below, being a gazetted officer of Government, to be estate officer for the purpose of the said Act who shall exercise the powers conferred, and perform the duties imposed, on estate officers by or under the said Act in respect of the public premises and within the local limits of jurisdiction specified in the corresponding entries in column 2 of the said table.

THE TABLE

Designation of Officer	Categories of public premises and local limits of jurisdiction
Officer of Special Duty, (now-defunct) Lake Medical College and Hospital, No. 3 Kyd. Street, Calcutta-16	Premises under the administrative control of the Union Ministry of Health within the limits of the Corporation of Calcutta as de- fined in the Calcutta Municipal Act, 1951.

[No. F. 32/11/64-Acc II.]

B. M. LAL, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

(Department of Agriculture)

(I.C.A.R.)

New Delhi, the 10th February 1966

S. O. 531—In pursuance of sub-sections (e) and (f) of the Indian Oilseeds Committee Act, 1946 (9 of 1946), the Central Government hereby appoint the following persons as members of the Indian Central Oilseeds Committee, to represent the interests shown against each, for the period ending 31st March, 1966 : —

Sl. No.	Name of person	Sub-section of Section 4 of the Indian Oilseeds Committee Act and interest represented.
1	The Joint Director of Agriculture (Headquarters), Jaipur.	Representing Government of Rajasthan under section 4 (e) of the Act.
2	Shri Ram Singh, Secretary, Farmers Form Scheme, Jaipur.	Representing growers of oilseeds in the State under Section 4 (f) of the Act.

[No. 8-12/65-Com.III.]

N. K. DUTTA, Under Secy.